Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/fiveworldproblem0000char_z6v9

FIVE WORLD PROBLEMS

By Charles E. Jefferson, D.D.

Five World Problems
Nature Sermons
Five Present-Day Controversies
Under Twenty
Old Truths and New Facts

Five World Problems

By
CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D.D., LL.D.
Minister, Broadway Tabernacle Church,
New York City

D
443
J4

NEW YORK CHICAGO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

241020

Copyright, MCMXXVIII by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 851 Cass Street
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 99 George Street

PREFACE

THESE lectures were not written for the public. They were informal addresses delivered in Pilgrim Hall, without notes, to the members of my own church, and dictated later on to my Secretary. My people had generously given me leave of absence for a year to make a tour of the world, and on my return I tried to show my gratitude to them by giving a series of eighteen discourses—five of which are included in this volume—in which I laid before them some of the things I had seen and pondered.

The lectures were originally intended solely for our Broadway Tabernacle Church family. But some of my friends have been so insistent on their publication that I have at last consented to give them to a larger audience. Many things have happened since they were spoken. It is best to let them stand just as they were delivered, as the expression of the conclusions of a traveller who, after thirteen months of continuous travel, had just returned home, with a mind filled with vivid impressions of a world very much upset.

C. E. J.

New York City.

CONTENTS

I

The Problem of India 9

II

The Philippine Problem 31

III

The Problem of China 61

IV

The Japanese Problem 100

V

The Hawaiian Problem 132

I

THE PROBLEM OF INDIA

INDIA is in my judgment the most fascinating of all countries in the world for the American tourist. It fascinates because of the number of surprises it presents. A stranger is surprised to find it so big. He has been in the habit of thinking of India as he does of Germany, France, Italy or Spain. He does not realize that India is a continent. To be sure, it is not a continent in the conventional meaning of that word, but in reality it is a continent. It forms a part of the continent of Asia, but it is cut off from Asia by the ranges of the Himalayas.

India has continental dimensions. If you take the eastern edge of it and lay it down on New York City, the western edge of it will fall upon Denver. If you take the northern point of it and lay it down on Portland, Maine, the southern point of it will fall upon Key West. It is nineteen hundred miles wide and nineteen hundred miles deep. It is big in population, having a population of 330,000,000, nearly one-fifth of all the people in the world, three times as many as we have in the United

---

Delivered January 20, 1927.

States. It has in it 750,000 villages, more villages than I supposed existed on the face of the whole globe.

It delights one by its endless variety. It has a variety of everything. In the first place, it has a variety of races. There are forty-five races in India, and they are all mixed up in the most amazing manner. I do not know how the scientists have been able to discover there are forty-five, for the races have married and intermarried and have been doing that for thousands of years. There is a variety of complexions, running all the way from black to nearly white. There is not a shade of white or of black or of brown or of yellow that you will not find in India.

There is a variety of languages. The experts say there are 222 languages in India, and the dialects are countless. It is a wonderful country for religions. It is the most religious continent in the world. It has 330,000,000 gods. There are Brahmans and Hindus and Moslems and Parsees and Sikhs and Jains, and there are different varieties of each one of these. There are in India two hundred and twenty million Hindus, seventy million Moslems, twelve million Buddhists, ten million Animists, and only four and three-quarter million Christians, two million of whom are Roman Catholics. The Protestant Christians are only a handful, but they are a bit of leaven which is going to leaven the whole lump.

It has a variety of beggars. Four million holy men wander over the country saying their prayers and begging alms. These holy men have very little on. Their naked bodies are smeared with ashes. Emblems of their creed are painted on their forehead. There is an endless and bewitching variety of colours. India is the most colourful country in the world. All the other continents are drab compared with it. All the colours are there in overflowing abundance, especially the brightest colours. The Indian sun picks up all the colours and glorifies them, weaves them into a splendour which falls like a spell upon the heart, and sets the whole land blazing.

It is a land of jewels. They flash on you wherever you go. All kinds of gems and decorations and ornaments are worn by the Indian women—around the head, around the neck, around the arms, around the wrists, around the fingers, around the ankles, around the toes. Jewels are hanging from the nose and from the lips and from both lobes of the ears. It is a country of jewellery. It has the greatest variety of vehicles of any nation under heaven. Every conceivable vehicle which has been manufactured since the days of Adam can be found in India. They range all the way from the oldest cart on two wheels to the latest model of the twentieth century automobile.

There is a vast variety of scenery. Travancore has all the loveliness and picturesqueness of Cey-

lon. It seems as though the Almighty must have looked at Ceylon and been so pleased with it that He said to Himself, "I will make a replica of it and put it down on the southwest coast of India and call it 'Travancore.'" Travancore is only Ceylon under another name. And then He said, "It is not right to confine the scenery of Switzerland to Europe. Asia ought to have some of it, too," and so He created Kashmir, which is a replica of Switzerland—just like it, except on a larger and grander scale. Besides all these there are the Western Ghats and the Eastern Ghats and the tableland of the Deccan, and the great plains of the Indus and the Ganges.

There is a variety of climates. Many Americans assume that India is a hot country, everywhere and always. They are mistaken. In South India it is always warm, but a part of the time it is exceedingly pleasant there. It gets exceedingly hot in summer. It is sometimes very cold in North India. In Middle India, it is both hot and cold on the same day, the variations in temperature running sometimes through fifty degrees. In that country, as in this, there are all kinds of climate. We have the climate of Bangor, Maine, and the climate of Miami, Florida, the climate of Arizona and the climate of Boston. India has even a greater variety of climates than we have.

It has a variety of castes. There are 2,300 of them. Twenty-three hundred groups of Indians

live side by side, and no one group is allowed to eat with the other group or to intermarry with them. There are fifty million Untouchables. It is needless to say that it is a continent of problems. No one can count the problems of India. There are agricultural problems, social problems, political problems, religious problems, racial problems, industrial problems, educational problems, physiological problems, and a hundred other kinds. The people of India are discussing all these problems with an enthusiasm and a vigour that would take your breath. The cities of that country are in an amazing intellectual ferment. Every city boasts of numberless organizations and societies, organized for doing every conceivable thing under the sun. Do not for a moment imagine that India is a quiet or sleepy place. The books that have been written about India are as multitudinous as the sands of the seashore.

It is often said that one ought to read up a country before he visits it. When I got to London I decided I would read up on India. I went into the British Museum and read as much as two or three days, and then gave it up as a hopeless job. I had had no conception of the literature on India. It is an infinite ocean without a shore. One could read six hours a day for three hundred and sixty-five days for fifty years and not begin to master the books that have been written on that one country. It would take a life-time to read the books on

Indian art, and another life-time to read the books on Indian architecture, and another life-time to read the books on Indian religions, and another life-time to read the books on the races of India. I found that if I expected to learn anything about India, it would be necessary to cable home and get my vacation extended to at least twenty-five years. After a few days I surrendered to the inevitable and decided to remain in ignorance of India.

And so I have come home very humble in my estimate of my knowledge of India. I was in India only sixty-three days, and I was on the rush every day of the sixty-three, hustling from one place to another. There are eighty-four cities in India with a population of over thirty thousand each. I saw only nineteen of them, and very little of each one. There are 750,000 villages, and out of that number I saw minutely only six. There are hundreds of learned and influential men in India, and out of that number I had interviews with about thirty. I tell you all this to give you an idea of the dimensions of my ignorance of India. It is because of my ignorance of India that I did not venture to take for my subject, "The Problems of India." I am too humble for that. My subject is "The Problem of India."

By "The Problem of India" I mean the problem which India presents to the British Empire, the problem which India presents to the world. I have

been studying that problem for a long number of years, and I always had a deep desire to see India at closer range. The Indian problem is enormously fascinating because India is the greatest modern experiment in imperialism. By imperialism I mean the dominion of one race over another. Great Britain has dominion over India. That is the greatest illustration of imperialism since the days of ancient Rome. A man in England called the "King" is Emperor of India. It was just fifty years ago this year that an English woman known as "Queen Victoria" took the title of "Empress of India." That is a phenomenon worth looking at. It is certainly one of the most amazing phenomena of our day, and one of the most momentous phenomena of the entire world.

Think what Great Britain is. Her people live upon 121,000 square miles of land, on two small islands off the western coast of Europe. Pause long enough to get an idea of how small a scrap of land 121,000 square miles is. That is smaller than New Mexico, ever so much smaller than Montana, about four-fifths the size of California, not half as large as Texas. Great Britain covers 121,000 square miles, India covers 1,800, 000 square miles, and yet the first rules the second. There are in Great Britain only 48,000,000 people. In India there are 330,000,000, almost seven times as many in India as in Great Britain, and yet the 48,000,000 rule the 330,000,000. No more interesting phenomenon

presents itself in our world. There are in the British Government of India only 3,000 men. There are 70,000 British soldiers in India. There are only 116,000 British-born men and women in India.

Here are some questions which keep coming again and again to all thoughtful minds. How long is Great Britain going to stay in India as ruler? When will she get out? How soon will she get out? How will she get out? What will be the effect of her getting out both on the prestige of the British Empire and on the destiny of the Indian people? Or, if she decides to stay, on what conditions will she stay? What will be the effect of her staying on British character and on Indian disposition? Those are questions which are easily asked, but are difficult to answer. On the day on which I left India I wrote in my notebook a series of questions something like those I have given you, and after each and every question I wrote down these words, "I do not know." "I do not know." "I do not know."

Let me at this point give you a brief chapter in history, because we must know how it came about that Great Britain got a foothold in India. There are only a few dates which we need to remember. In the year 1600 there was organized in the City of London a trading corporation known as the East India Company. Its business was to carry on commerce in the Far East. It began to establish

trading posts in different parts of India. For a hundred and fifty years it carried on its work, silently penetrating the country. It met with obstacles. It got into innumerable snarls, but it grew all the time, becoming larger and mightier. It was necessary often for it to fight the Indians, for they did not at all times deal justly with the British traders, and the British traders defended their rights and in many cases perpetrated wrongs on the Indians. In those times India was in a chaotic condition. There was no unity of opinion or unity of government in India. It was made up of a great number of warring states. The East India Company played off one group of Indians against another group. We are not to suppose that Great Britain conquered India by sending over an enormous army, trampling India under her foot. She did nothing of the sort. India came into possession of the East India Company bit by bit, because it was assisted by the Indians themselves.

In many cases it was far better for Indians to be ruled by the East India Company than by their own countrymen. England had to fight, however, again and again for the privileges she obtained, and by and by, in the year 1757, there was fought a battle which the historians consider a cardinal date in the history both of England and of India. The Battle of Plassey was fought in the year 1757. In that year the last formidable enemies of the East India Company went down. From that day on, the

East India Company had practically its own way in India. For a hundred years, from 1757 to 1857, England ruled India through the East India Company. India was in a chaotic condition, and all sorts of wrong things were done on both sides. Indian affairs were constantly coming to the attention of Parliament. Englishmen did not agree what was best to be done, but for a hundred and fifty years the East India Company kept on growing, not only as a trading company but as a political power. It had its governors and its courts and its armies, becoming a little kingdom under the kingdom at home, and then, in 1857, something terrible happened—the Sepoy Rebellion. The Indian troops of the East India Company army revolted. A variety of causes drove them to this, which need not detain us now. The massacre by the Indian troops was atrocious, and the vengeance wreaked upon the Indians was horrible. The British people came to see that the time had arrived when Indians must be governed not by a commercial corporation but by the British Crown directly. The British Government stepped in and took the place of the East India Company.

That was seventy years ago. For seventy years India has been governed directly by the British Parliament. India is under the rule of a Viceroy, who is appointed by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, who is answerable to the British Parliament. British rule, then, in India covers one hun-

dred and seventy years, a hundred years through the East India Company acting as trustees, the last seventy years through the Viceroy, the appointee of the British Crown.

And what are the results of this British rule? Here we enter a region of fierce controversy. Indians do not agree on the answer, nor do Britons, nor do travellers. You cannot get unanimity of opinion on a matter like this in any company of thoughtful people. There are some who keep their eyes steadily fixed on the good things which have come out of British rule, and certainly there are many blessings. Let me remind you of just a few of them. First of all, law and order. India was a land of Oriental despotism, and now and then a land of anarchy. The Indians were ruled by men who ruled by caprice. Great Britain has swept anarchy away. She has put the whole land under law and order. You feel the same security in India that you feel in England. You know that the mighty hand of the British Crown is over you. Great Britain has established peace. Before Great Britain entered India, India had been torn by war for five hundred years. Wars followed one another in interminable succession. Invading tribes were always sweeping in through the mountain passes on the northwest. Sometimes they were Persians, sometimes Afghans, sometimes Turks, sometimes Mongols. They came again and again, laying the land waste. No such invading armies come any more.

They dare not come. Great Britain is there. There is internal peace. In the old days civil wars were common. They occur no more. There are occasional riots between Hindus and Mohammedans, but nothing approaching the dimensions of war. Great Britain has established the *Pax Britannica*. Great Britain has put an end to barbarous customs, and particularly the self-immolation of widows. She has also stamped out the ancient curse of thuggism. Cruelties that had been practiced for a thousand years have been ended by the strong hand of Britain. She has given the country a common language, the English language. By means of the English language there is coming to be an increasing unity of purpose in India.

Every Indian of prominence with whom I spoke conceded that the gift of the English language is one of the best things that Britain has done for India. She has given India also a system of railroads which will compare favourably with the railroads of any country. The management is capable, the trains are fairly comfortable and run on time. Travelling is as safe in India as it is in the United States. There are nearly 40,000 miles of railroads today in India, and only about 7,000 in all China. There are 200,000 miles of highways in India, many of them of high grade. To be sure there have always been roads in India, but the ancient roads have been improved by British engineers. The British engineers have also built dams and

great irrigation works. One work cost almost $100,000,000. By means of these irrigation works, Britain is fighting famine, one of the deadliest foes of India. She has built for India several great cities of remarkable beauty. Bombay and Calcutta and Madras are cities of which any country might well be proud. The spaciousness of the great buildings amaze the stranger. I never saw more colossal law courts and office buildings and hospitals and universities than I saw in these three cities. There are great parks, great boulevards, and great institutions of every sort. When you go to Delhi and look at the number of new governmental buildings going up there, you feel that you are in the presence of a race of supermen. One cannot look upon those stupendous buildings in Delhi without feeling that it is the intention of Great Britain to remain in India forever. Britain has carried into India all the comforts and luxuries and inventions of the West. We have nothing in New York that one does not find in the great cities of India. They have our telegraph, our telephone, our radio, our wireless stations, our airships. There is nothing here that cannot be found there. She has given India a system of education which, however defective, is immensely superior to any which India possessed before Britain came.

But in spite of all these improvements and blessings there are people like Mrs. Besant who are not willing to give Great Britain credit for anything

she has done. In their judgment India is worse off today than she would have been had Britain never come. "Look at her poverty," they say. "No such poverty anywhere else in the world. See her emaciated millions, many of them living on one meal a day, and that a meagre one. Why has not Britain relieved this poverty? Look at her ignorance. Only one man in ten can read or write. What has Britain been doing? She has been spending the money of India on her army. Nearly one-half of all the revenues of India go into the British Army. Only one-fifth of the sum spent on the army is devoted to education. All the Viceroys and all the Governors keep saying year after year that education is the greatest of India's needs, and yet Britain keeps right on spending nearly one-half of all the money raised in India upon the army. Look at the unrest of India, the discontent, passing now and then into a fierce bitterness that is dangerous." It was forty years ago, in the year 1886, that the Indian National Congress voted this: "We cannot be grateful to British rule for degrading our nature, for systematically crushing out all martial spirit, for converting a race of soldiers and heroes into a timid flock of quill-driving sheep." This spirit of discontent is one of the results of British rule. Who knows to what lengths this discontent is going to run? It may be that India is a pus-sac secreting a poison which is seeping into the veins of the colored races of the world. There is a growing

antagonism to imperialism not only in India but in China.

All over China I saw great placards saying in Chinese characters, "Down with imperialism." The brown men and the yellow men are coming to feel that it is not right for the white men to lord it over them. Little by little the conviction is deepening that the day of imperialism must end. The present feeling in China is not directed to individuals in the West. The Chinese have nothing against missionaries as teachers of religion, but they are fiercely opposed to imperialism, and they look upon teachers and missionaries as representatives of the imperialistic system, a system that cannot be tolerated longer in Asia. I do not see how this discontent will ever grow less, or how the unrest will ever be gotten rid of, for Britain keeps right on feeding the Indians the very food which nourishes discontent. The educated Indians are reading John S. Mills, the speeches of Burke, the works of Herbert Spencer, the orations of Gladstone, and the poems of Milton and Wordsworth. Indians are reading the lives of Garibaldi and Mazzini, and how can they read such books and retain quiet hearts so long as they are under the rule of a foreign race thousands of miles away?

It is because of this influence of India on other countries inhabited by brown men that the Indian problem becomes a world problem, and that we Americans ought to be thinking about it. If a

nation adopts the policy of imperialism, it must adopt the program of a big navy. In order to keep India, Britain must keep trade routes open. In order to do this she must be Mistress of the Sea. It is necessary for her to have possession of Gibraltar. She must be Mistress of the Mediterranean, for otherwise she cannot hold India. She must be in possession of the Suez Canal, otherwise her position in India is not secure. But she cannot have a big navy without other nations wanting a big navy, too.

A number of years ago an officer in the United States Navy, Captain Mahan, wrote a volume entitled *Sea Power*. In that book the American naval officer showed that England had been able to gather a large part of the habitable world into her hands by means of her navy. The book fell under the eye of the Emperor of Germany. He made up his mind that Germany should be mighty on the sea, too. It became a slogan through Germany, "The future of Germany lies on the sea." Under the leadership of Von Tirpitz the Emperor proceeded to build up a huge German navy. Great Britain grew alarmed. A race of armaments set in, the outcome of which was the World War. And thus you see that a large part of modern history is unintelligible unless you understand the problem of India.

Lord Roberts, the hero of the Boer War in the years preceding 1914, went up and down England

urging the people to prepare for the coming conflict. He frankly said that Britain had carved out her empire by the use of the sword, and that Germany would attempt to do the same thing, and therefore it behooved Britain to be ready for her. The doctrine of preparedness and the policy of a big navy are both rooted in the principle of imperialism, the doctrine that one nation has the right to rule another.

What is the present situation in India? The situation is better than it was a number of years ago. One of the ablest of British journalists, Mr. J. A. Spender, visited India in 1925, and thus he was in the country the same time I was there, although our paths did not cross. Since he has returned he has published a volume entitled, *The Changing East*. In that volume he declares that wherever he went in India he found a more friendly feeling between the British and the Indians than he had met with fourteen years before. He found that the British were ready to come more than half way and showed an attitude quite different from that which he had found on his preceding visit. Moreover, he found a changed tone in the press. The British press was willing now to treat Indian aspirations and movements with greater sympathy than they had shown heretofore. As I had never been in India before, I did not know whether the situation was better or worse. I talked with distinguished leaders in every city which I visited and

I found a variety of views among them. The majority of them asserted that they would be content with dominion status within the empire. They want India to occupy a place similar to Canada and Australia. In other words, they want "Home Rule." There are radicals, however, and I met a few of them, who will not be satisfied with anything less than total separation from Britain.

I spent an hour one afternoon with Mr. Gandhi in his home at Ahmedabad. He spoke with great freedom of his attitude to Great Britain. He said he would be content with dominion status. I asked him what he thought would happen if British rule were completely abolished. He did not think that any permanently disastrous results would follow. He thought that India ought to be allowed to work out her own problems in her own way. Like most of the other Indian leaders with whom I had the opportunity to converse, he was serenely confident that the Indians are able to take care of themselves. He refuses to be frightened by direful predictions of civil war and political and social chaos. He is not afraid of the Mohammedans, and is sure that Hindus and Mohammedans would very soon learn to live peaceably together.

Gandhi has a sweet spirit and a winsome smile. He has had many a defeat and disappointment, but they have left no trace of bitterness in his soul. Nor have they left him despondent. He is the same brave, confident, persistent, unconquerable man he

has been from the beginning. He wore only a loin cloth and sat upon the floor. His body was emaciated, and his conversation was friendly and straightforward. He met me as an equal and made no effort to dominate the current of our conversation. He speaks perfect English and his voice is soft. Almost from the first moment I felt at home, and we talked as though we were old friends. I could hardly realize that I was in the presence of the most influential Indian alive.

Politically, Gandhi is dead. Spiritually, he is a tremendous force. They say that no man within the last twenty-five hundred years has exerted so much influence over the millions of India as this man. Not since the days of Gautama has any man been able to do what he has done. He is something of a visionary and his nearest friends have come to acknowledge that he is not politically wise. He has hobbies, and one of his hobbies is that every Indian shall spend a part of the day in spinning cloth. He is against Western machinery, and thinks that the Indian problem can be solved by every Indian going back to the spinning-wheel. He himself spins a certain number of hours each day. Every professor in his school does the same. That is his dream for all India, that everyone shall do his bit at the spinning-wheel every day. In this Gandhi is mistaken. You cannot turn the world back, the world will persist in going on. Civilization has invented new machines by which cloth

shall be spun. The world will never go back to the spinning-wheel any more.

Gandhi also has strange ideas in regard to the cow. In this he is a true Hindu. He thinks the veneration of the cow is essential to the future prosperity of India. He himself is at the head of a cow protective association. Some of his views seem to us quite singular. He is a great believer in fasting. Whenever anything goes wrong he fasts. When any of his followers commits a crime he fasts. Whenever his pupils do what he considers wrong he fasts. This fasting of Gandhi makes a deep impression on his countrymen. They believe that there is a magical efficacy in vicarious fasting. All of this shows how far apart we Americans are from Indians. Suppose that Senator Borah should decide to fast. We would all laugh. Suppose the newspapers should report that the Senator from Idaho had refused to eat anything for ten days because of some sin committed by his party. We should take it as a great joke. But in India when Gandhi fasts, the hearts of the people are awed, and they believe that by his fasting the atmosphere of the nation is cleansed.

The impracticability of the man's mind came out in the great boycott which he organized a few years ago. Mr. Gandhi is a Tolstoyan pacifist. He does not believe in the use of physical force for the attainment of spiritual ends. He believes that everything worth while can be obtained by soul

force. In order to show his condemnation of Great Britain he urged his countrymen to boycott everything English. He would convert the British Empire into an Untouchable, and urged his countrymen to have nothing to do with it. According to his plan, everybody was to take a vow not to buy anything made in England, not to buy anything imported from England, not to act as judge in any Indian court, not to plead as a lawyer in any court, to give up all titles and honours received from the British Government, not to attend any government-controlled school. The movement became known as the Non-cooperative Movement. The idea was to bring the British rule of India to an end by passive resistance.

The movement failed. It was bound to fail. The Indian people were not ready to carry out such a program. In spite of Gandhi's order not to commit actual violence, rioting broke out in many cities. Horrible things took place, and again and again Gandhi went on a fast to show his deep sorrow over the excesses of his followers. Things grew worse until finally the British Government felt obliged to arrest Gandhi and throw him into prison. He was condemned to imprisonment for six years, but the poor man fell sick and had to undergo a serious surgical operation. After he had been in prison for a little less than a year, the government set him free. Gandhi is no longer at the head of the political Home Rule party. He still

retains his supremacy, however, in the hearts of his countrymen. No man in India has so much influence as Gandhi. Tagore is a more brainy man with a finer culture, and is more gifted in the writing of musical speech, but he is not so great a saint as Gandhi, and therefore lacks his power. Gandhi failed in his Non-cooperation Movement, but he did something that no other man has been able to do: he aroused the peasants of India as they have never been aroused before, and by his protest against British rule he has made a mark on the mind of Great Britain which will never be effaced.

Mr. Gandhi had several lieutenants assisting him in his work. One of the ablest and boldest of them all was Mr. C. R. Das. He died only two years ago, and his body was reduced to ashes on the burning *ghat* of Kali, amid the lamentations of the greatest crowd of people that Calcutta has ever seen. Before Das died he sent this message to his people: "I feel the handcuffs on my wrists and the weight of iron chains on my body. It is the agony of bondage. The whole of India is a vast prison. What matters it whether I am dead or alive?" That is the sob which comes up out of the deep heart of India. That sigh is heard in heaven and must be reckoned with on earth.

II

THE PHILIPPINE PROBLEM

THE last man who wrote a book on the Philippines ended his volume with this sentence, "A great treasure is in our hands, but a great problem." He chose for the subject of his fifteenth chapter, "A Thankless Burden." He happened to be in the Philippines the very winter I was there, although we did not meet. I was there only a few days, and he was there several weeks. He had access to governmental information, and had opportunities to hold interviews and conversations with Filipinos, Americans and foreigners. It is an interesting fact to me that he brought home with him three words—"Treasure," "Problem" and "Burden." I select the middle word for my subject—"Problem."

Many Americans do not think often of the Philippines. A majority do not. Indeed, very few of us think of them. That is true even of the thoughtful Americans. Most of us do not know anything about them, and we care even less than we know. If I can induce some of you to think

---

Delivered February 10, 1927, prior to death of General Wood.

more seriously about them than hitherto, I shall not have spoken in vain.

Let us begin with the islands. There are 7,083 of them. Two-thirds of them are small and do not have any name. We are concerned now with only two—Luzon and Mindanao. Luzon is as large as Ohio. Mindanao is the size of Indiana. If you put all the islands together you would have a territory as large as Arizona, or, to come nearer home, you would have a piece of land as large as Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut and New York—115,000 square miles. These islands are spread out over a large expanse of sea. If you should put the most northern island on Chicago, the most southern would rest upon Galveston, Texas. The extremes are 1,152 miles apart. If you should put the most eastern island on Boston, the most western one would fall on Cleveland, 682 miles apart. All of the islands are south of Cuba and run within five degrees of the equator.

If you look north from Manila—if you had eyes keen enough—you could see Formosa sixty-six miles away. If you could look over the top of Formosa you would look into the streets of Shanghai, hundreds of miles farther north. If you should take an aeroplane and sail south from Manila you would fly over the Dutch East Indies. Borneo would be on your right, New Guinea on your left, the Celebes under you, and if you should go on

directly south you would land in Australia. The nearest Japanese territory to the Philippines is sixty-six miles off. The nearest Dutch territory is forty-three miles off. The nearest British territory is twenty miles off. Standing in Manila and looking eastward you look across the Pacific Ocean to Nicaragua. Looking westward, you look into Indo China, 500 miles away. It is 700 miles from Manila to Hong Kong, 7,000 miles to San Francisco, and 11,000 miles to New York City. It takes thirty days to go from New York to Manila. In Manila you are a long way from home. I always like to know the physical environment before I take hold of any problems. Physical facts often throw light upon various phases of a problem.

Let us now look at the peoples of the Philippines. Some persons say "people," but that is not accurate. It is a mistake to assume that there is only one people in the Philippines. There are three races there—the Mongoloid, the Negroid and the Malaysia. There are forty-three tribes, and these tribes speak seven languages and eighty-seven dialects. One tribe cannot understand what another tribe is saying. Twenty-one languages and dialects have been printed. Only three of these peoples need concern us now. First there are the Moros—400,000 of them living in Mindanao. Next come the non-Christian tribes, many of them in North Luzon, the most conspicuous of them be-

ing the Igorots. There are 700,000 of these. Next come the Filipinos—10,500,000 of them.

In other words, nearly all the natives of the Philippine Islands are Filipinos—10,500,000 out of 12,000,000. The Moros are Mohammedans. The non-Christian tribes are Animists. The Filipinos are Christians. They have been Christians for hundreds of years. But they are not Christians of the same type to which we are accustomed in the United States. They are Spanish Christians—Christians that have been brought up in the Roman Catholic faith as interpreted by Spain. The masses of the Filipinos are ignorant and more or less superstitious. It is important to remember the distinction between the non-Christian tribes and the Filipinos. You have all seen pictures of natives of the Philippines. They appear from time to time in magazines and papers. They are pictures of barbarians wearing nothing but a breech cloth, engaged in wild and savage dances. After feasting your eyes upon those pictures you have a big surprise awaiting you when you arrive in Manila. You find yourself in a city of 300,000 people, nearly all of them Filipinos. You find they are as well dressed as the people on Broadway. When you talk with them you find they are as intelligent as the people you know at home. When you study their behaviour you observe that there is a certain grace and elegance of manner which surpasses much of the behaviour you see in New

York. These people have been under Spanish influence for three hundred years, and something of the Castilian grace has been distilled into their behaviour. You feel you are in a city of gentlemen and ladies.

The next time you look at a picture representing the natives of the Philippines as savages, bear in mind that that is probably a piece of propaganda for the purpose of proving that the Philippine Islands should not be granted independence. All the newspapers and magazines which are opposed to independence carry on a campaign against it by showing pictures of the Philippine savages. Not long ago the Director of Posts in Manila requested that a law be passed prohibiting the sending into the United States of photographs and engravings of the non-Christian tribes. General Wood turned down the request flat, saying it was unworthy of serious consideration.

We are not yet ready for the problem. We cannot understand it without an historical background. Let me give you, then, the history of the Philippine Islands in a few sentences. They were discovered by Magellan in 1521. They fell into the hands of Spain twenty-one years later. They took their name from the King of Spain, Philip II. They remained in the hands of Spain 356 years, coming into our possession at the end of 1898. They came to us in this way: In the month of January, 1898, we declared war against Spain for the purpose of

liberating Cuba. We had in the Far East a commodore by the name of Dewey, who was in charge of our eastern squadron. When he reached Hong Kong our Government cabled him to see to it that the Spanish fleet be not allowed to come out of the harbour of Manila. Dewey sailed at once for Manila, and on the first day of May he met the Spanish fleet and sent the whole of it to the bottom of the sea. By our naval victory we got possession of Manila Bay, but we had no soldiers to capture the land, and it was not until the month of August that our soldiers arrived. On their arrival, Manila surrendered to the American Army, and by the Treaty of Paris, signed December 10, 1898, the Philippines were ceded to the United States. Later on we agreed to pay Spain $20,000,000 for them. That is the way we got them from Spain, but we had to get them from the Filipinos, also.

The Filipinos had been struggling against the stupidity and tyranny of Spain for forty years before the Spanish-American War began. There had been thirty-four revolts before the year 1872, all of them short-lived, and all of them coming to nothing. A succession of heroes arose, one after the other, in the years from 1872 to 1898, all of them struggling to secure reforms for their country. The most illustrious of these reformers, José Rizal, wrote a book attacking the iniquities of the friars which stirred up the Filipinos almost as much as our people were stirred up by *Uncle Tom's*

Cabin. Finding that Rizal was likely to cause a revolution, the Spanish Government seized him, and, after a mock trial, a firing squad took him outside the city of Manila and shot him. He died at the early age of thirty-five. His death occurred in 1896, two years before the battle of Manila Bay. On his death he became a national hero, almost a national saint. His statue is everywhere. His spirit is in the Philippine air. You can feel the throb of his heart in the Philippine people. After his death the insurrectionary spirit grew stronger.

One of the boldest of the Philippine leaders was Aguinaldo. He was in Hong Kong and Dewey sent a gunboat to bring him to Manila. He set him ashore and told him to organize an army. This Aguinaldo did, and captured in a short time several thousand Spanish soldiers. In the month of June a Philippine Republic was proclaimed. This was before the American soldiers arrived. The Filipinos rejoiced in the presence of the Americans, knowing that the Americans were great lovers of independence and liberty, and evidently expected the Americans to turn the islands over to them. They were already in possession of the islands, except Manila and three or four other cities, but our Government did not care to deal with the Filipinos. We dealt entirely with Spain, and when we got the islands from Spain we assumed that they belonged to us. The Filipinos did not think so, and

so Aguinaldo proceeded to make war on us. This he did all through the year 1899 and through half of the year 1900. At the end of that time the strength of the Filipino army was broken and President McKinley offered amnesty to all who had taken arms against the United States. But a guerilla warfare went on which became worse and worse. The Filipinos shot our soldiers as soon as they were captured, and we shot all the Filipino soldiers that fell into our hands. It was butchery on both sides. When the Filipinos captured our men they tortured them. When we captured Filipinos we tortured them. It was a ghastly, diabolical business; a chapter of history that no one can look back on with pride. Early in 1901 Aguinaldo surrendered, and from that time to the present day there has been no armed resistance in the Philippines to the United States. Those are two things, then, worth remembering—we got the Philippine Islands from Spain by a naval victory, and by paying to Spain $20,000,000. We got the Philippine Islands from the Filipinos by a short and bloody war, and we endeavoured to compensate them by opening 4,000 schools and sending 500,000 Filipino boys and girls to school.

We are now ready for the problem. The problem is, " What shall we do with the Philippines? " That was the problem in 1898. After we got them we did not know what to do with them. There were three opinions among the American people.

Some people said, "Hand them back to Spain. They belong to her. Why should we keep them, simply because of Dewey's victory? Certainly you are not obliged to keep forever everything your hands fall on in the course of war?" But to this there was a cry of opposition—"We must not turn these islands back to Spain. They have suffered for over 300 years under her intolerable tyranny, why should we punish them by turning them back to her? We have freed the Cubans, why not free the Filipinos, too? Let us take them and set them free." But to this there was a cry of protest. "To set them free, compelling them to travel alone along a road on which they have had no experience, would be cruel. It would be like putting a baby upon a doorstep in December. We cannot set them free. We must keep them in order to protect them. We must keep them and train them, and after we have trained them in the science of self-government, then we can set them free." This third opinion was the one which ultimately prevailed. Millions of conscientious Americans felt that that was the only righteous thing it was possible for us to do. It was our duty to keep them. We did not covet them. We had not wanted them, but in the providence of God they had fallen into our hands, and this was an indication that in the councils of heaven it was foreordained that we should be their protector and educator. This was the opinion of our President, Mr. McKinley. He

was a religious man with high ideals, and he expressed, in language clear and unequivocal, the mature conviction of a great number of the most conscientious and thoughtful people in this country. Here are his words: "The Philippines are ours not to exploit but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government. This is the path which we must follow or be recreant to a mighty trust committed to us." And so, in 1899, twenty-nine years ago, we decided to keep the Philippines.

But the problem is with us still. It has been with us every year for the last ten years. What shall we do with the Philippines? There are three answers to the question, and our American people are divided. Answer number one is: "Let us keep them." But whenever that is said, we are confronted by the fact that it is embarrassing to keep them. In the first place, it is embarrassing because of our Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence reads, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among them are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We hold that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it." That is the Declaration of Independence. That is

the fundamental American belief. That is the political creed of the American people. It is embarrassing to carry that in one hand and the Philippines in the other.

It has become more embarrassing since President Wilson coined his famous phrase, "Self-determination." That expression dropped like a word of fire from heaven into the hearts of hungry nations, and when it leaped at once to take a place by the side of the immortal phrases of Washington and Lincoln, the whole world came to feel that America stands for just that—the right of every people and every nation to control its own affairs. It is embarrassing to hold the Wilson theory in one hand and the Philippines in the other.

It is embarrassing because of the Monroe Doctrine. In the month of December, 1823, President Monroe wrote a message to Congress in which there were a few paragraphs concerning our attitude to foreign nations which have made that message immortal. The whole world has heard for more than a hundred years of the Monroe Doctrine. The gist of the Monroe Doctrine is this: "That no nations of the Eastern Hemisphere will ever be permitted to take possession of territory in the Western Hemisphere, or to assert political sovereignty over the populations thereof." For a hundred and four years we have flaunted that doctrine in the face of the world, letting the whole world know that we are ready at any time to fight for it. We have said in a

voice that everybody has been able to understand, that we will have no nation or people of the Eastern world step into the Western Hemisphere as a political power. But all at once we break into the Eastern Hemisphere and gather up 7,000 islands, establish a political sovereignty over 12,000,000 Orientals and tauntingly remark, "What are you going to do about it?" It is embarrassing to hold the Monroe Doctrine in one hand and the Philippines in the other.

It is still more embarrassing because of our promise. We have never given a promise outright that we were going to grant the Philippines their independence on any particular date, but all of our Presidents have used language which has excited expectations in the minds and hearts of the Filipinos which are not easily satisfied. Mr. McKinley always spoke as though we were going to keep the Philippines only a little while. Mr. Roosevelt talked in the same manner, and so also did Mr. Taft. In his message to Congress in December, 1920, President Wilson said: "It is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise by granting them the independence which they so honourably covet." President Harding, shortly before his death, declared, "No backward step is contemplated." Not only have our Presidents spoken in bold and clear language, but Congress has put itself on record in favour of independence. The preamble of the Jones Bill, passed in 1916, reads

thus: "Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty from the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein." This certainly is a promise, and the Filipinos do not forget it. It is embarrassing to go right on holding the Philippines in one hand, with our own promise placarded before all the world. What shall be do, then, with the Philippines; shall we keep them or give them up?

Many people say, "Give them up." But it is risky to give them up. It may not be risky for us, but it is risky for them, and it is risky for the whole world. In the first place, if we give them up that may precipitate civil war. The Moros hate the Filipinos. The Moros are Mohammedans. The Filipinos are Christians. The hatred between them is hereditary. You have the same condition there that you have between Belfast and Dublin, and between Roumania and Bulgaria. If the United States Government should withdraw its hands a civil war between the Moros and the Filipinos is not unlikely. There might also be a war between the Igorots and the Filipinos, for they also are enemies of one another. Nobody knows what would happen if the United States should withdraw tomorrow from the Philippines. Secondly, it might precipitate political anarchy. The Filipino people produce a large number of leaders. These are very

ambitious and exceedingly active. We do not know what might happen in case of our withdrawal. The thing that has already happened in China might happen in the Philippines. China is at present torn asunder by the ambitions of many military despots. Who knows what would happen if the United States should withdraw? Who knows what would become of the Filipino peasant? He has already been trodden down by the caciques or petty kings. He had never known anything like justice until the Americans came. Miss Mayo, in her interesting book entitled *Isles of Fear,* gives the testimony of a Filipino farmer, Diego Tecson, who said to her, "I want independence, but not for two hundred or three hundred years yet. Give us time to become educated. Give us time to grow strong in order to be able to protect ourselves. Don't hand us over to the mercy of our robbers." We do not know what might happen to the masses of the peasants if our country should withdraw.

In the third place, it might precipitate economic ruin. The Philippines have great natural resources, but it takes money to develop them. Capital is not forthcoming unless you give security. If the United States should withdraw from the Philippines, who would invest money there? The Filipinos have not the confidence of the financial world. Filipino bonds are held largely by American investors. What would happen to these bonds if Americans withdrew? By the United

States policy, commerce between the Philippines and the United States now amounts to $176,000,000 a year, an increase of thirty-four-fold in twenty-five years. Her whole foreign trade amounts to $208,000,000 a year. This has been built up steadily through the years, and it might all collapse should the Americans withdraw.

In the fourth place, it might precipitate a world war. Should we give the Philippines up, they would be helpless. They cannot defend themselves. They have no army and no navy, and they could not build up an army or a navy that could compete successfully with greater powers. If a nation therefore wanted them, it could take them. Which nation we do not know. Japan might want them, or the Dutch might want them. The Dutch have other islands in that part of the ocean which they have cultivated successfully. They might want the Philippines. Or Russia might want them, and rather than have Russia or Holland have them, Great Britain might want them. We do not know what might happen should the Americans withdraw. The whole world is in a state of unstable equilibrium, and it does not take much sometimes to precipitate a disastrous collision. It is embarrassing to keep them, and it is risky to give them up.

And therefore a third answer is suggested. Let us keep them for a while longer. Let us name a definite date when we are going to give them up.

How long shall we keep them? Some people say ten years. Mr. Kirby Page thinks that is long enough. I have been told that Mr. Quezon would be satisfied with that date. Others think that twenty-five years would be better. Ex-Vice-Governor Gilbert, the other night, said that in thirty or forty years they might take a plebiscite and decide what they were going to do. Some think a hundred years would be none too short a period. Mr. Nicholas Roosevelt, who has written the latest book on the subject, thinks that we ought to stay there at least two or three generations, that is a hundred years. There are other people who do not think it is either wise or possible to set any precise date. We cannot bind the future. We do not know the social or the political conditions that may prevail fifty or even twenty-five years hence. Therefore we cannot say what we shall do. This is the opinion of General Wood. He puts the whole matter off into an indefinite future. This is the opinion of Colonel Thompson in his report to President Coolidge. He says, "I recommend that the granting of absolute independence be postponed for some time to come." Earlier in his report he said, "It would be a long time to come before they were ready for independence."

And thus you see we are dealing with a difficult problem. You do not know how difficult it is until you begin to think about it. It is far more complicated than most people imagine. It is foolish,

therefore, for anyone to proclaim dogmatically that he knows what is the wisest and best thing to do. It is absurd to say that all intelligent people are agreed, or that all decent people think the same thing, or that all noble people who have a conscience hold the same position. There is no room for dogmatism, and I hope that one of the effects of my lecture will be the creation of a spirit of humility on the part of all of us so that we shall refrain from speaking oracularly upon a matter about which unanimity of opinion is impossible.

Let me now give you the arguments pro and con. You can weigh them for yourselves. Why should we keep them? Because we want a commercial base. A majority of the human race live within 3,500 miles of the Philippines. The commerce of the future is to be around the Pacific. We need a port of distribution for American products in Asia. We need a depot for our goods. We owe it to ourselves and to the whole world to establish in the Philippines a base from which we can carry on our commercial operations. It is only by having that base that we shall be able to serve with our native and manufactured products the great populations of the East.

We need the Philippines for a naval base. If we are going to maintain our position in the Far East we must have a navy, and the navy cannot exist without a base. There must be coaling stations. There must be a harbour for our warships. There

are many people who feel that as the world is now constituted, a great navy is indispensable to any nation which wishes to exercise great power for good. That was the opinion of Theodore Roosevelt, and that is the opinion of millions of Americans. We have got to have a navy in order to hold our own and do our work. And since we have got to have a navy we must have a naval base in the Philippines.

We need the Philippines as a religious base. From the Philippines we can exert a spiritual influence upon all parts of the Eastern world. We can begin with the Moros and with the Igorots, and then we can extend our influence over the Dutch East Indies, and the British East Indies, and over the whole continent of Asia. This is an argument which has been advanced by General Wood. He says that America in the Philippines insures the effective deployment of Christianity for the regeneration of the world.

It is a treasure, a great treasure. It is rich in mines, gold and silver and copper and iron and coal, all of these existing in abundance. The islands are rich in forests, and they are rich in fertile soil. A million five hundred thousand acres can be devoted to the growing of rubber. We have 20,000,000 automobiles in the United States. We use three-quarters of all the rubber produced in the world. In the Philippines we can produce 70,000 tons a year. Not only can we produce rubber but

we can produce spices and all varieties of tropical goods sufficient to supply our home markets, thus delivering us from the monopoly certain to be established by other nations. What a fool to throw a casket of jewels away when God Almighty placed that casket in your hands! That is the fourth argument.

It is a sacred responsibility, this Filipino problem. They need us. They cannot get on well without us. We gave them an opportunity under Governor Harrison to see what they could do, and they got everything in a mess. Their death rate ran up from twenty per thousand to forty. They went into the banking business and lost $37,000,000. They put Filipinos into office in Mindanao, stirring the Moros almost to insurrection. It has been demonstrated that they cannot successfully manage their affairs without our assistance, and therefore it is our sacred duty to remain.

Here are the five arguments which are commonly offered for retaining the Philippines. Each one appeals to a great number of our people. Some are moved by the commercial argument, and some by the navy argument, and some by the religious argument, and some by the profit argument, and some by the ethical argument. All together they constitute a mighty host standing steadfastly for the retention of the islands. These are the five fingers of the hand by which we maintain our grip on the Philippines.

Now let us look at the arguments for giving them up:

First. They do not want us. They want their independence. They cry for it day and night. It is often said that they do not want it. I do not believe it. I did not find a Filipino in Manila who did not want it. They think about it day and night. You cannot talk with a Filipino for half an hour without him bringing up the subject of independence. Their legislature every year in both houses passes, without a dissenting vote, a request for immediate independence. They send every year to Washington City a commission begging for independence. They appoint a day of prayer every year to pray for independence. They have never taken a plebiscite because they have never been permitted to do it, but they have shown in every possible way that they want independence. All their high school boys want independence, and all their high school girls want it, and all their college students want it. The best educated Filipinos cry for independence.

Second. We promised to give them independence. We did not set the date, but they think that the time is up. They were willing to be patient for a season. They think that the season is at an end. Our Congress has said that they shall have independence as soon as a stable government can be established. They say the stable government has

been established, and therefore it is time for us to keep our word.

Third. They are becoming suspicious. Some of them are becoming bitter. Our presence is irritating them more and more. We have 12,000 soldiers there. Soldiers are always an irritating body to a freedom-loving people. Our fathers went wild at the sight of a redcoat. The tension grew worse and worse until finally the revolution came. We have naval aeroplanes whirring and buzzing over the heads of the Filipinos. I try to imagine how I should feel with a foreign aeroplane whirring over my head. The Filipinos have flaunted before their eyes every day of the week, the paraphernalia of force, the symbols of military strength. We are exasperating them by our display of physical power.

Fourth. The risks which have been pictured are not so formidable as they seem. All of them can be reduced by intelligent action on the part of the United States. The United States can adjust its tariff relations with the Philippines in such a way as to work for the benefit of both. The United States can negotiate treaties with the great powers guaranteeing the independence of the Philippines. The United States can by way of advice serve the Philippines in every department of its Government.

Fifth. We must get out some day. There are only 7,000 Americans in the islands, and there are

12,000,000 brown men there. As soon as the 12,000,000 brown men make up their mind that the 7,000 white men are not wanted, the 7,000 white men will depart. There is no doubt that we shall get out of the Philippines some day. I prophesy with great boldness certain coming events. I understand the purpose of the universe well enough to know that some things will happen, and some things will not happen. I never deal with times and seasons. Those are in the hands of God. Only the Almighty knows the times and the seasons, but it is for men to know that certain things shall be. I know that imperialism is doomed. The time will come when one race will not rule another race, or one nation another nation. Great Britain has gotten out of Egypt. Some day she will get out of India. She is already taking steps to get out of China. All her concessions there will some day be given up. We are going to get out of the Philippines. That is written on the scroll of fate.

Political matters in the Philippines are just now in a muddle. Some of you are wondering what the trouble is. You say, "What is the matter with Governor Wood?" What is the matter with Quezon? Roxas? and Osmena? There was a break in 1923, and for the last three years things have been in a lamentable condition. What is the matter with General Wood? There is nothing the matter with him. What is the matter with Quezon?

There is nothing the matter with him. The root of the trouble is an ineradicable love of liberty. The Filipinos love liberty. They love it all the more because they have had so little of it. They loved it before we went to the islands. They love it more now because we have fed them on the literature of freedom. We have given them the speeches of Washington, of Lincoln and of Wilson. We have given them the poets of freedom—Longfellow, Lowell, Emerson and Whittier. We have fed them on the Declaration of Independence and on the Constitution of the United States. We have held ourselves up as an example of a people who broke away from a foreign nation because we were determined to be free. Let no American be surprised, therefore, if things are in a muddle in the Philippines. We have created in the Filipino heart a desire for independence that nothing short of independence will satisfy.

The Filipinos want self-government above good government. We do the same. We do not put good government first. Every one of us prefers self-government. There is no doubt we can rule the Filipinos better than they can rule themselves. They have not had the experience that we have had. If they were absolutely free they would blunder again and again and get into many distressing predicaments, but they prefer self-government to good government. Mr. Quezon is reported to have said, " Better a government run

like hell by the Filipinos than a government run like heaven by the Americans." That is what we all say: "Better a government run by ourselves than any sort of government run by foreigners." London is a better ruled city than New York, and so also is Berlin. The English and the Germans have had more experience than we have had. They can do the thing better. But I would rather live under Tammany Hall than under the best government contrived and carried out either by Englishmen or Germans. I am such a believer in self-government that I do not want Albany to be putting its finger into our New York pie. I want New York City to run itself. If 6,000,000 people have not wit enough to manage their own affairs, then it is time we were giving up the experiment of self-government. The Filipinos want to govern themselves. They want the privilege of making their own mistakes. We ought to sympathize with them because they and we are just alike.

What is the matter with General Wood? He is in an impossible situation. Things got into a great mess in the seven years of the governorship of Governor Harrison. Governor Wood was sent to straighten things out. That is always an ungrateful business. The legislature had been allowed to encroach on the privileges and powers of the executive. General Wood was there to re-establish the rights of the executive. That is always an exasperating business. Nobody could have suc-

ceeded. The Governor vetoes measures passed by the legislature, and the legislature refuses to confirm officials nominated by the Governor. There is a deadlock between the executive and the legislative members of the government. We have deadlocks here. Why do we have a deadlock again and again between our legislature and Governor Smith? The reason is often innate cussedness. But suppose Governor Smith were a foreigner, the deadlocks would be more numerous than they are. Why do we have a deadlock now and then in Washington City between a Republican Senate and a Republican President? Suppose the President were a foreigner? We should have a deadlock all the time. Let no one be surprised, therefore, that there is a deadlock in Manila. Human nature is the same the world over, and you cannot have a foreigner over a Filipino legislature and expect to have uninterrupted peace.

Let me now give you my conclusion in regard to the whole matter. I agree with Colonel Thompson that there is blame on both sides—on the side of the Governor-General and on the side of the Filipino legislature. I agree with him that the military atmosphere of our Governor has not a little to do with the trouble. The Governor himself is a military man. He has surrounded himself by a coterie of military advisors and attachés. A freedom-loving people does not like a military government. I agree with Colonel Thompson that the govern-

ment of the Philippines should be taken out of the hands of the War Department and put under civil officers. I should go further than Colonel Thompson went. He did not advise the recall of Governor Wood. He did not advise this in so many words, but you can read between the lines that he thinks it would be better for General Wood to come home. He compresses his commendation of the Governor into one frigid sentence. I want to be more just than that. I want to commend Governor Wood. He is an exceedingly able man, and as noble as he is able. He had a chance to be the President of the State University of Pennsylvania, and he turned down that offer in order to take the office of Governor-General of the Philippines, and he did it solely because he felt it to be a duty to his country. He was our best fitted man for that office. The things that had to be done six years ago were things he was best fitted to do. He went into the position with his eyes open. Some of his friends had urged him not to go. They told him he would be thwarted at every step, that he would be abused by both sides, that he would be misunderstood and maligned both in Manila and in the United States. But his reply was that he had always been urging Americans to make a sacrifice for their country, and now the time had arrived for him to put into practice his principles. He is a noble, able man, and he loves the Filipinos and wants to do everything possible for their highest good. But, never-

theless, I think he ought to come home. There is no reason why he should make a further sacrifice. He has stirred up so much resentment in so many quarters that he is now handicapped in everything he tries to do. The Viceroy of India holds his office for only five years, and that is long enough, I think, for a Governor-General in Manila. Let him come home, and let some civilian take his place, and begin a new chapter in our relations with the Philippines. That is my first recommendation.

My second is, Let Congress act. Let Congress speak. Why should Congress be silent through so many years? The Wood-Forbes Report was made in 1921. It offered certain definite recommendations, but Congress has been mum ever since. Congress did not accept the recommendations, nor did Congress reject them. Congress said nothing. The result is that the Filipinos put one construction on the silence of Congress, and Americans put another construction on it. Why cannot Congress speak?

In the third place, I recommend that we state a definite date when independence shall be granted. It is unwise, I think, to put the matter into the indefinite future. I do not agree with Colonel Thompson in saying, "Let us wait for some time yet." My suggestion is, let us wait twenty-five years. In twenty-five years we should have time to adjust things that have to be adjusted. We could carry on the educational program much

further. Over sixty per cent. of the Filipinos are still illiterate. In twenty-five years we could reduce that to forty per cent. or less. Moreover, we could do a needed work among the Igorots and among the Moros, the kind of work that cannot be done by the Filipinos unassisted by us. Furthermore, we could negotiate treaties with various nations and formulate our tariff arrangements, thus serving the interests and rights of our business men in Manila. We could push forward the cause of agriculture. Only ten per cent. of the land is now cultivated. We could more than double that in the next twenty-five years. We could bring the islands into a far higher state of preparedness for self-government than they are now in, and could do things which would reduce the risk of putting the whole government into their hands. By naming a definite date we could stop the present agitation, reduce the friction, take away much of the bitterness, allay the fears, and give fresh hope to the Filipino people.

I love to dream of things that ought to be. I have a lovely dream for the Filipinos. I do not want the islands to be a dependency or a possession of the United States. I do not want them to be a mandate. I do not want them to be a colony. I want them to be a little brother. I want the United States to play the part of a big brother—something that has never been done in history. I want the big brother to look after the little brother, and to

help him in every way he can. I want him to loan his little brother experts in every department of national life, sanitary experts, expert engineers, expert educators, expert administrators. Why not loan the Filipinos a great body of able men every year, we paying the bill out of our own treasury? The Philippine Islands have never cost us anything yet beyond the $3,000,000 we gave once for famine relief. The Filipinos have paid for their roads and their hospitals and their schools out of their own treasury, so why should not the rich United States invest ten or twenty million a year in furnishing expert councilors for the guidance of the Filipinos in the difficult work they have to do? Why should not twenty of the wisest Americans and twenty of the wisest Filipinos gather periodically around a table and talk over all the educational and commercial and agricultural and financial matters, trying to find the best possible solution for every one of those problems? I want my country to be Christian. I want the United States to serve. I often read these words of our Lord: "You know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you. Whosoever would be great, let him be your minister. And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant. Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." In other words, the universe is built not on the

principle of dominion, but on the principle of service, and only the nations who are willing to serve will endure. I want my country to carry the torch unextinguished down the ages. It cannot do it unless it lights that torch at the heart of God, unless it becomes the servant of His Son and stands among the nations as one which serves.

III

THE PROBLEM OF CHINA

WHAT is the matter with China? Everybody is looking at her. I can remember the time when nobody looked at her. Everybody is talking about her. There was a time when nobody in America was talking about her. She is now on the front page of the newspapers every day along with the murderers and robbers and other people of distinction. There was a time when she was not mentioned even on an inside page of the papers. What is the matter with her that everybody is thinking about her?

What ails China? Evidently she is sick. A big crowd of doctors have gathered around her. They are making diagnoses and are writing prescriptions. They are shaking their heads as though they were not certain just what ails her.

What is the matter with China? She is in a state of violent agitation. She seems to be having spasms. She is tormented by convulsions. The convulsions seem to be growing worse all the time. What is the cause of her sickness?

She is in a deplorable predicament. She is in a

Delivered March 17, 1927.

worse predicament than any other nation on earth. How did she get into it? Who pushed her into it? How will she get out of it?

China is in a state of vast upheaval. The foundations of her civilization seem to be crumbling. She is built on the side of a volcano, and through the crevices molten lava is pouring, which is burning a multitude of her people to cinders. What is the matter with China? That is a question which every thoughtful man and woman ought to face. That is the most intricate problem to which any man can just now bend his mind. It is a tremendously important question. First of all, because of the size of China. We like big things. China is more than big, she is huge. If you pick up China and lay her down on the United States you have blotted the United States completely out of sight. You run as far north as Alaska and as far south as Gautemala. The eastern edge of China will run out over the Atlantic, and the western edge will run out over the Pacific. An immensely big country is China.

Her population also is vast. We commonly say she has 400,000,000 people. That is a guess. Nobody knows how many people there are in China. Her people have never been counted. All the figures given are simply guesses. The Chinese Post Office estimates the Chinese population as 444,000,000. The Custom House guess is 436,000,000. Dr. Linn, the President of Amoy University, thinks

that all the figures are exaggerated and that probably the number is not much over 300,000,000. Whatever figure you fix upon, the population of China is enormous. China has probably a quarter of all the people on the face of the earth. What a huge bundle of life that is! I marvel at the man who is not interested in China.

It is an interesting question because of her age. She is the oldest nation on earth. Her recorded history runs back four thousand years. All the other nations of antiquity have passed away. She alone has survived. She had a high civilization when our ancestors in Britain were semi-barbarians. She had made advances in the sciences and arts when Athens was only a settlement of huts.

We ought to be interested in her because of her tremendous strength. What cohesive power her population possesses, that such a mass of people should hang together through the tempests and convulsions of four thousand years. There is nothing like it on the face of the earth. What assimilative power she has! She has swallowed up innumerable tribes and several mighty races, subduing them to herself by the inherent power of her irresistible genius.

We ought to be interested in her because of her latent power. We do not know yet what she is able to do. Her physical resources have never been calculated. They have as yet been scratched

only on the surface, and as for the powers that lie hidden in the deep Chinese soul, all that we can do is to stand in their presence awe-struck and wondering. Today she is politically weak, but all students of world problems concede that she is destined to be one of the mightiest nations on earth. Today she is politically impotent, but it may be that within five hundred years she will be at the head of the procession of all the nations of the world. We do well, then, to ponder with great reverence the problem of China.

As soon as you ask, "What is the matter with China?" you get a Babel of answers. The answers are confused and conflicting. Some say that the missionaries are to blame. Not long ago the president of the P. & O. Steamship Company made a speech in London in which he blamed the commotion in China upon the missionaries. He said they were teaching the ideas of equality and independence, and that these ideas, causing a ferment in the Chinese mind, had produced the disturbances and commotions of the present time.

Others say that the traders are to blame. It is the merchants and the manufacturers, the big business men, who have been exploiting China, who are responsible for what is now taking place. They have been for years hustling one another in their rush for raw materials and cheap labour. It is they who have gotten into their hands the concessions and the settlements and the leases, and

who have staked out spheres of influence, filling the whole land with unrest.

There are others who say that it is the diplomats who are to blame. After every war they have framed treaties which they have compelled China to sign at the mouth of a gun, and into these treaties they have put stipulations and agreements which are totally unfair, and it is because of this diplomatic selfishness and greed that China is today in a state of upheaval.

There are others who say that the Bolshevists are to blame. It is a few men in Moscow who are responsible for a large part of what is going on in China. It is because Russia is teaching Communism to the Chinese that you find this anti-religious and anti-western movement all over China. The Russians have succeeded in poisoning Canton, and from Canton as a centre the poison is flowing through the veins of the entire country. There are many people who think that.

There are others who put the blame upon all the foreign powers put together. It is not any one power that is responsible, but all of them in their united action. They have all acted in much the same way. They have, whenever opportunity has offered, cut a slice off the territory of China. Great Britain cut off two or three slices. France cut off a slice. Germany cut off a slice. Russia cut off a slice. Japan cut off a slice. All the foreign nations have acted like so many robbers.

They are responsible for the condition which China is now in. They are always intruding into the politics of China. They play the war lords against one another. They give protection and comfort to political demagogues and mischief-makers. It is the foreign powers who are responsible for the upheaval in China.

There are others who say that China herself is responsible for all the trouble. The commotion is rooted in the Chinese character. It is because of the awful ignorance in China and the unbelievable political rottenness in China, the whole country being honeycombed by what we call "Graft," and the Chinese call "Squeeze." It is because of the ambition and cruelty of her military lords, and because of her lamentable incapacity in municipal administration and because of her belatedness in managing the affairs of society, it is because of her own fault and her own sin that China is in such a doleful predicament. There are many people who think that.

There are others who are inclined to blame the universe. It is because the world is what it is that China is where she is. There is nobody to blame in particular. The explanation lies in the nature of things. China has arrived at the point at which she now stands because of the decrees of an inscrutable fate.

Whenever one is studying a complex phenomenon, he is compelled to admit there is no single

cause which is large enough to account for it. There are always many contributing causes. When you see a mighty river rolling to the sea, you know that it did not flow from a single spring. You know that all along its course rivulets have come tumbling down the hillside, hastening to make their contribution to the onflowing tide. You know that out of many a sequestered valley a river has flowed in, increasing by its offering the mighty volume of onrushing water. Just so it is with the China of our today. Many causes have contributed to create the situation which is now the puzzle and the tragedy of the world.

In dealing, then, with the Chinese problem, one is obliged to enter the realm of controversy. Whenever you are dealing with a problem with many roots and many phases, it is impossible that all students should agree. Men of equal intelligence and equal nobility and equally well informed will pass different judgments and arrive at diverse conclusions. You have noticed that no one can write a letter to the newspapers expressing any opinion about what is going on in China, without somebody else pouncing down on him the next day contradicting everything he said. No man can stand on a platform and talk about China to a company of thoughtful and well-read people and expect everything he says to be accepted by the entire company. There is no unanimity of opinion in regard to anything connected with China.

It was a great surprise to me when I arrived in that country to find such a diversity of opinion among the Americans who are living there. I knew that we in America were all divided, but I supposed it was because of our ignorance. I found that the same confusion and divisions which we have here exist in China also. The missionaries are by no means agreed in their opinions. They often differ from the merchants. Nor do the merchants agree among themselves. They are as divided as the missionaries. I found that Americans do not agree among themselves, nor do the British agree among themselves, nor do the Chinese agree among themselves. They are as much divided as the foreigners. They do not agree in their estimate of Sun Yat-Sen, of Wu Pei Fu, of Feng Yuh Siang, or of Chang Tso-lin, or of Yuan Shih-kai. They are not agreed as to what is the best thing for China, whether a monarchy established over the whole country or a republic established over it all, or whether there should be a federation made up of autonomous provinces. It is because of the complexity of the situation that you have such a diversity of opinions, and therefore one must be on his guard not to be too dogmatic in his utterances.

I found out that the people who have lived the longest in China are the most reticent when it comes to talking about the Chinese problem. The younger people know a good deal more than the

older people know. Dr. Arthur H. Smith, who had been there fifty-four years, when he was asked by a newspaper correspondent to give him the bottom facts, immediately replied, " There is no bottom." For fifty-four years Dr. Arthur H. Smith had been looking down into the abyss of Chinese life and had not been able to find the bottom. When you ask the oldest missionaries in China about the future, they hold up their hands in despair. They do not know what the future is to be. I asked Dr. Smith how long this upheaval is to last. He refused to set any date. All he said was, " It will not end in this generation." When I asked the President of Amoy University how long this turmoil was going to continue, he replied, " Possibly a hundred years."

I therefore warn you not to imagine that I understand much about the Chinese problem. I have never done such a bold thing in my life as I am doing now. My only excuse for doing it is that I was in China two whole months. Having been there two months, I feel competent to give a lecture. If I had been there one month I would have written a book. If I had been there two weeks I would now be syndicating articles to all the papers in the country. I candidly confess I do not know much about the Chinese problem, but I know a little, and it is that little which I want to communicate to you. While I was in China only two months, it is surprising how much one can

learn in sixty days if he keeps his eyes and his mind wide open. I want to tell you some of the things I learned in China. They have helped me to see the problems of China more clearly.

I have always contended that no one knows any country until he has been in that country, and that no one can understand any people until he has lived in their midst. I had read a good deal about China, but I now realize that I did not know China at all. I had met a Chinese now and then in America, but I did not know the Chinese people. The Chinese nation was hidden in mist. The mist was so thick it was really a fog. The Chinese problem was a hopeless mystery to me because of the thickness of the fog. I was the victim of many illusions. My mind was full of misunderstandings. My sixty days in China taught me to read the newspapers in America with greater discrimination. You must be on your guard when you read the newspapers or they will surely mislead you. Nearly all the cablegrams which come to this country come either from Hong Kong or Shanghai, both of them British cities. They are therefore likely to be coloured by the prejudices of British reporters. The Chinese just now have it in for the British. There has been a long boycott of Hong Kong by Canton which has seriously crippled British trade. It is not surprising, therefore, that the British should have deprecatory estimates of the Chinese people.

When I was travelling in India I heard nothing but the most terrifying descriptions of the Cantonese. I was urged not to go to Canton. When I arrived in Hong Kong I found that Thomas Cook & Son were not advising anybody to go to Canton. But when at last I arrived in that city and talked with our American missionaries of the Canton Christian College, I discovered they had an entirely different opinion of the Cantonese. I found they had high respect for the Canton leaders, and that they repudiated the notion that Canton was a puppet of the Bolshevists in Moscow. And now when I read in our papers any intimations that it is the Bolshevists who are really running China I take it with a grain of salt and hasten on.

Before going to China I knew that the country was in a state of national anarchy. There is no central government there with authority over the whole country. I supposed that anarchy would mean chaos. That is what it would mean in America. We could not live here without a national government. We would fall to pieces in a very few months. But a central government is not essential in China because of the traditions and culture of the Chinese people. The Manchus were on the throne for two hundred and sixty-eight years, but they ruled China very little. They kept off by themselves. They did not interfere with the local self-government and not very much with the provincial government. They collected

taxes as all governments do, but beyond that they allowed the people to get on by themselves. There are twenty-two provinces in China, and each one has a government of its own. We have in our country the doctrine of State rights. They have the same doctrine in China, but they carry it much further than it has ever been carried in this country. Moreover, they have a system of village government, the like of which we do not possess. The village government is based on guild government and family government, so that the Chinese do not need as much external government as we need. National anarchy in China does not mean what an American would think it ought to mean. To be sure, there are spots of chaos in China. When a lot of bandits get loose and defy the provincial government, and break to pieces the guild government, then you have chaos; but there are only a few chaotic spots in all China. I was surprised on my arrival there to find everything going on almost as naturally and normally as it goes on here at home. I had to go to China to learn that.

Before going to China I had read for weeks about fighting in China. I expected to have battles raging around me wherever I went. I was in China two months and saw no fighting at all. There is fighting in China, but it is localized. They do not fight over the whole country at once. There might be fighting here in Maine when there was no fighting in Texas. There might be fight-

ing in Minnesota when there was no fighting in Florida. China is a big country, and there can be a deal of fighting in one section of it while the other three-quarters have no fighting at all. I saw plenty of soldiers, but they were all smiling, good-natured farmer boys. It was hard for me to believe that they would ever take delight in fighting anybody. The newspapers are always telling you about fighting, but do not imagine that that is the only thing that is going on in China.

Before going to China I had heard interminable stories about the disorder in China. It seemed to me that life must have come to a standstill. I was surprised to find in all the cities I visited that life was going on as of old. In every city I saw funeral processions and wedding processions. In every city I saw building operations going on almost as vigorously and extensively as they are going on here in New York. All over the country I found trade going on. The statistics of China show that the foreign commerce of China has been increasing every year since 1918. The volume of commerce last year, one of the most disturbed of all years, was the largest in the history of that country. I had to go to China to learn that a country may be in a state of political anarchy, and at the same time be prosperous in business.

I had heard about the anti-foreign feeling. The papers tell us about that seven days in the week.

One would suppose that everybody in China hates foreigners and is waiting for a good chance to kill them. I travelled from Canton to Peking and did not see any manifestation of anti-foreign feeling in any city or village. I was on the lookout for it, for I expected it, but I never found a trace of it. Everywhere I was treated with courtesy. They knew, of course, that I was a foreign devil, but they treated me as though I were a gentleman. I never smiled at a Chinese that I did not get a good brotherly smile in return. I had not the slightest fear of the Chinese anywhere. I rode many miles in rickshaws through crowded streets, and you do not know how narrow Chinese streets are, and how jammed they are. You can have no conjecture here in America of how many Chinese there are in China. When you are in a rickshaw you are in an ocean of Chinese. They are on the right of you, and on the left of you, in front of you and behind you. I used to meditate on how easy it would be for anyone to stick a knife into me without anybody knowing who had done it, but I felt absolutely safe. There is anti-foreign feeling in China in the sense that there is a resentment against the policies of the Western governments, but there is no feeling against individual foreigners. So far as my observation went there is nothing but friendly feeling toward the people from the West.

I was almost afraid to go into China because of

what I had read about the bandits. I had been told again and again about one of their favourite customs of catching a man and cutting off one of his ears and sending it in with a note that a certain sum of money must be forthcoming. If the money is not paid at once, then the other ear is sent in with a note demanding still more money. I felt there must be a devilish streak in the Chinese character to make possible such atrocities as that. But when I got to China I discovered that they are not barbarians or savages. They are a very gentle people. They have sat at the feet of three men—Confucius, Lao-tse, Buddha, all of them teachers of gentleness. There is no more gentle people on the earth than the Chinese. Here in America we have white men, just a few of them, who will cut off a negro's ear, or burn a negro at the stake, but such action does not exhibit the nature of our American people. We have savages here, white savages, and they have savages in China, yellow savages. A mob in China is what a mob is everywhere. A mob is everywhere a beast, a devil. You never know what a mob is going to do. You can set no limit to the atrocities that a mob will perpetrate. That is true in America. That is true in China. But the most of the Chinese people are gentle. You must go to China to find out how wonderfully gentle they are.

Before going to China I had read about the

railroads, how the military lords had taken possession of them, how again and again they were all tied up so that civilian traffic was impossible; and I drew the deduction that any American would inevitably draw. Here in America we are dependent upon our railroads. We cannot live without them. Tie up our railroads and you bring our industry to a halt. Tie up our railroads and you starve our cities. No American city can live more than a few weeks unless the railroad trains are running. That is not so in China. China is not dependent on her railroads. She has very few. There is only seven thousand mileage in all that vast country. Commerce is carried on the backs of animals and men today, as it has been carried for the last four thousand years, and therefore, even though all the railroads of the country are tied up, that makes hardly a ripple on the surface of Chinese life. It is a temporary inconvenience for the people who want to travel by rail, but it does not cut the arteries of the nation's life. I had to go to China to learn that.

From all that I had been able to read in the papers, I concluded that China was moving backward, sliding toward the pit and likely to go into it. Nobody had ever intimated to me that there was any such thing as progress in China. I had not read in any paper that there were forward-looking movements in China which were making commendable progress. Three-quarters of all the

news we get in the papers about China is political news. Only about fifteen per cent., it is said, is educational or cultural news. I had to go to China to find out what wonderful progress has been made during the last fifteen years in education. The young people all over the country in China are eager for education. They are hungering and thirsting for larger knowledge. Fifteen years ago there were only fifty colleges in the whole country and now there are a hundred and twenty-five. Fifteen years ago there were only nine thousand college students and now there are forty thousand. Fifteen years ago only one per cent. of the people were literate, and now fifteen per cent. are literate. An American traveller visiting Peking was conducted through the National University of that city. It was in the month of January and the recitation rooms were cold and the library was like a refrigerator. The American traveller, wondering how students could submit to such discomfort, spoke of it to one of them. The student replied, "We did not have enough money to buy both coal and books, and so we decided to buy books." There you get a revelation of something that is indescribably beautiful in the Chinese character—a willingness to submit to any form of discomfort in order to secure the higher values of life.

I sat by the side of a man at a banquet in Foochow, a teacher in one of the government schools, who told me the government owed him

five thousand dollars, and he did not know whether he would ever get it or not. He did not seem depressed. He was a teacher and he loved to teach. It was his joy to teach whether he got any pay for it or not. In Peking there were professors in the National University who had been teaching for I do not know how many months without any salary whatever. Their friends in one way or another succeeded in getting enough food to keep them alive, and they went right on teaching. I was surprised on arriving in China to find myself not in the midst of a lot of pessimists who had given up hope for the future, but, on the other hand, I found myself talking with optimistic men who were interested in education and whose hearts were all aglow because of the marvellous advancement that has been made within the last few years. Unless you have looked into the subject you have no idea how many associations, conferences and federations there are in China engaged in the great work of extending modern knowledge to all the provinces of that great country. There are thousands of Chinese hearts tonight which, in the midst of great political disturbances, are bounding with hope.

Let us now come back to the question with which we started. What is the matter with China? I want to suggest an answer. The situation in China is the inevitable reaction of the impact of one civilization on another, the impact of one world

on another, the East and the West. China is in a state of transition, or, to put it more accurately, China is in a state of revolution. She is passing today from one state of national existence to another. Indeed, there are four revolutions which are going on at the same time. First of all, there is a cultural revolution. The old system of education in China is giving way to our Western system of education. In the second place, there is a religious revolution. The old religions are being modified because they are being brought into contact with the religion of the West. In the third place, there is a political revolution. The Chinese people are passing from the conception of monarchy to the principle of democracy. In the fourth place, there is an industrial revolution. The steam engine has gone to China, and with the steam engine the factory, and with the factory the labour union, and with the labour union there are lockouts and strikes and interminable controversy between labour and capital.

We have gone through these four revolutions, and it took us five hundred years to do it. Our Renaissance came in the fifteenth century, and it took us more than a hundred years to get through it. We came in contact with the Greek learning, and we had to think out our philosophy and our art in the light of the ideals and ideas of the ancient Greek thinkers. In the sixteenth century came our religious reformation. The world had

outgrown the Roman interpretation of Christianity. It could no longer be held by multitudes of thoughtful men. It took a hundred years to make the necessary readjustments. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries we had our political revolution. It started with the Civil War in England, and it ended with the American Revolution and the Revolution in France. In the nineteenth century we had our industrial Revolution, and all the nineteenth century was filled with commotion occasioned by the industrial disputes. Look back over those five hundred years and what a period of incessant commotion and disorder, controversies and tumult, and what a period of bloodshed. We had the Seven Years' War, the Thirty Years' War, the Hundred Years' War, the English Revolution, the American Revolution, the French Revolution, and a score of smaller revolutionary wars. Why should we be surprised because there is tumult in China? Why should we be horror-stricken because there is bloodshed in China? If it were impossible for us to go through these four revolutions without a vast and bloody upheaval, without a series of tragic cataclysms, why should we expect China to pass from the old order to the new without anarchy and chaos, civil war and the shedding of blood? Therefore, we should beware of superficial judgments. There is reason for depression, but not for despair. Darkness does indeed brood over the face of the deep, but the spirit of God is at work in

the midst of the darkness, and some day a new China will appear.

It would be interesting to take up these four revolutions one after the other, but it would be necessary to have an evening for each one of them, and all that I can do tonight is to deal with the political revolution alone. I assume that you know that China was ruled by the Manchus from 1644 to 1911, a period of two hundred and sixty-eight years. In 1911 there was an insurrection against the Manchu rule, and after a war of five months the Manchu dynasty surrendered the throne, and on March 10, 1912, Yuan Shih-kai became the first president of the Chinese Republic. That is a good date to remember—March 10, 1912. From that day to the present hour the political life of China has been bound in shallows and in miseries. In this period of fifteen years China has had three constitutions, and the constitution which she now has is not obeyed by anybody. In this period she has had seven presidents, if you count the Provisional President, Sun Yat-sen. In this period she has had forty cabinets, and the forty cabinets have been for the most part puppets of military chieftains. Today she has no constitution, no president, no parliament, no electorate, no supreme court. There is no Chinese Republic except in name. She cannot have a parliament because the military lords will not permit it. All she has is a shadowy something which she calls a cabinet, a

cabinet without authority except in the city of Peking. There is no line in English literature that so well describes the condition of China as this line of Matthew Arnold—"Wandering between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born." China wants to be a republic, but she has not the strength to become one. That, in a nutshell, is the best description of the political situation in China.

It is difficult to establish a republic. Mr. H. G. Wells, the other day, told the Sorbonne of Paris that democracies cannot produce stable governments. It was very difficult for us to become a republic. There is a book by John Fiske entitled *The Critical Period in American History,* which every American ought to read. It shows how exceedingly difficult it was for us to become a republic, and how narrowly we came to failing in our efforts to extricate ourselves from the anarchy following the revolutionary struggle. If it was difficult for us, we need not be surprised that it is difficult for China. We had only three million people, she has four hundred millions. We had only thirteen small colonies, she has twenty-two big provinces. We had a comparatively small country, just a strip along the Atlantic seaboard, she has an enormous country, the distance between Canton and Peking being as great in time as the distance between New York and Moscow. We had only one language to deal with. I do not know

how many languages and dialects there are in China, but the people in one province cannot understand the people in another, and the people in some of the cities cannot understand the people who live outside on the farms. Moreover, the heredity behind our fathers assisted them in doing their work. Twelve hundred years of experience made it easier for them to manage democratic principles, but the traditions of four thousand years in China are against the idea of a republic. The fundamental conceptions of Chinese philosophy do not prepare the mind to think in national terms. When you think of all the obstacles that China has to meet in her effort to adopt a republic, no one need be surprised that the road has been steep and thorny and that very little progress has been made.

It is a pathetic struggle. I want to pause long enough for you to look at it. Wherever I went in China I felt the spirit of Matthew Arnold saying, "Wandering between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born." Many of the pagodas are very old. Some of them have toppled over, others of them are at the point of falling, and that is symbolic of the decay of China's ancient faith. I visited the old Examination Halls in which young men in former years came to pass examinations in the Chinese classics. Those examination halls are vacant. The old educational system has fallen. Another system is struggling to take its place. In

Peking I wandered through the Forbidden City, and the Forbidden City is a deserted city. I went from palace to palace, all of them sealed. The officials under whose guidance I went, broke the seals one after the other, permitting me to see the secrets hidden within.

> "I 'felt' like one
> Who treads alone
> Some banquet hall deserted."

In Peking I went to the Temple of Heaven, one of the most beautiful buildings in all China. There was only one man in it, a poor specimen of a Chinese who was selling pictures of the building. All over the building were evidences of decay. That beautiful structure is falling in ruin. I went to the Altar of Heaven. I stood on what for centuries was the most sacred spot in China. The grass and the weeds are growing up between the marble slabs. It was there the Emperor of China was wont to go once a year to offer up prayers for his people. But there is no emperor now. There is no high priest to plead for China. There is no potentate to protect her from her enemies. There is no centre around which her people can rally. It is the most pathetic and tragic situation in the world. She is indeed "wandering between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born."

That, as I conceive it, is China's major problem. It is not the problem, however, about which most

Chinese are just now thinking. They have concentrated their attention upon another problem—getting rid of Western imperialism. I have dwelt upon the other problem at great length because so many Chinese, especially the young Chinese, are in danger of overlooking it. There are many Chinese who, in my judgment, are exceedingly superficial in their study of their own country. They blame all their troubles upon outside nations. They assume that if it were not for the Christian powers of the West, China would have no trouble whatever. They make Western imperialism a scapegoat on which they saddle all the sins of the Chinese people. The Chinese problem is a problem of the Chinese people, and it would exist if outside nations had nothing whatever to do with China. If Western nations should bring all their gunboats home, and all their soldiers home, and all their marines home, the Chinese problem would still exist. If Western nations should give up all of their settlements and all of their concessions, and all of their leases, the Chinese problem would yet remain. If the nations of the West should tear up all their unequal treaties, and give up all their extra-territorial privileges, and make a solemn vow never to touch the Chinese customs again, the Chinese problem would still remain. If all the foreign traders should come home, and all the missionaries should come home, and all the nations of the earth should hold aloof from China for fifty

years, the Chinese problem would remain, because the Chinese problem is the creation of the ideas which are burning in the Chinese mind and the feelings which are surging in the Chinese heart. It is not simply the foreigners who have gone into China who are responsible for the unrest and upheaval, it is also due to the Chinese who have studied in Great Britain and Europe and America. We have today two thousand Chinese students in our country. For the last fifteen years we have had large numbers of Chinese students in our universities and colleges. All these men have gone home carrying with them Western ideals. We did not compel these men to come here. We did not order them to go home and teach the things they learned here. They came of their own accord, and returned of their own accord, and of their own accord they are putting the American leaven into the Chinese lump of life; and therefore the Chinese are in part responsible for what is going on today in China.

But there is no doubt that Western nations have complicated the Chinese problem. It is doubtless more vexatious and feverish and baffling because of the policies and programs of the nations of the West, and therefore we ought to acquaint ourselves with some of the things that have been going on during the last eighty years. Without a knowledge of these things we cannot understand all that is going on at present in China.

First of all, we must acquaint ourselves with the so-called unequal treaties, treaties which China has been forced to sign at the mouth of a gun, treaties in which she made promises which she should never have made, and granted privileges which she should never have granted. It is because of these treaties that millions of Chinese hearts are on fire. And then we must learn something about the settlements. There are several of them in China, the most important of them being the one in Shanghai. Indeed, there are two settlements there, one called "The International Settlement," which is really a British settlement, although two Americans and one Japanese have places in the City Council. The other is the French Settlement. The British Settlement contains over a million Chinese, six thousand Britons and two thousand Americans. The bulk of the wealth of the city is in the hands of Chinese, the Chinese paying seventy-five per cent. of all the taxes; and yet the Chinese have not a single representative on the municipal council. The council is made up of nine men, six of them Britons, two Americans and one Japanese. The city is policed by Great Britain, and she imports for that purpose five hundred bearded Sikhs from India, men who despise the Chinese, and who are despised by the Chinese in return. There are public parks in Shanghai supported by public taxation, but not a Chinese can go into any of the parks. There are

playgrounds in Shanghai, but no Chinese child can play on any one of them, although they are supported by public taxation. One must understand all this before he can understand what is going on in China.

One must also know something about tariff regulations in China. For over eighty years the nations of the West have decreed that China shall not charge over five per cent. duty on goods imported into that country. Other nations can build their tariffs as high as they please, but China must keep her tariff low, exceedingly low. It must not run higher than five per cent. And to this policy of tyrannical greed the United States has been a party for eighty-three years. Of all the countries of the world ours is the last one which would have been expected to take part in so drastic a policy. We have a country notorious throughout the world for its high tariffs. We insist on a high tariff for the cultivation of our domestic industries. Why should China want to protect its industries? We do not allow her to do it. We have a high tariff in order to secure abundant revenue for the support of our government. China would like to have money to support its government, but we will not allow her to have it, not unless she gets her money in some other way. All American goods going into China pay only five per cent., but if rugs come to this country from China they pay a duty of fifty per cent. If embroideries and laces come, they

pay a duty of eighty per cent. If jade and tungsten come, they pay a duty of one hundred per cent. We make it as difficult as possible for Chinese goods to get into this country, but we insist on the right to dump our goods almost without restriction upon the people of China. You must understand the history of tariff legislation through the last eighty years if you would understand the ferment that exists today in the Chinese heart.

And, then, you must understand something about the foreign gunboats that patrol some of the rivers and lakes of China. And you must know something of the soldiers of Tientsin and the marines of Peking. All these things you must know in order to understand why so many Chinese think there is nothing the matter with China except the inflammation caused by the wrongs which she has suffered at the hands of Western powers. The treaties are a thorn in her flesh, and so are the settlements, and so is the tariff, and so are the armed forces. The Western powers have plaited a crown of thorns and thrust it down on China's head.

For years China has been suffering, but the tragedy came to a climax on the thirtieth of May, 1925. For the information of those who do not have the time to follow the current of foreign affairs, let me say that in the month of May, 1925, a Chinese was shot dead by a Japanese guard in a Japanese factory in Shanghai. This killing was

immediately resented by a body of students, and they went into the streets in order to protest against it. They made excited speeches in various parts of the city, the result being that six of them were arrested and thrown into jail. This greatly exasperated their comrades, and on the 30th of May a great procession of students and others proceeded to the jail in order to protest against the imprisonment of these six students. There is no telling what a great crowd of men will finally do, and the police officer in charge of the prison lost his head and ordered his guards to fire. With only a moment's warning these men shot into the crowd, killing nine Chinese and wounding twenty-five others. The next day still others were killed, until the number of the killed amounted to twenty-two. These doings set China on fire. In every large city of the country meetings of protest were held, and on June 11th a riot occurred in the city of Hangkow in which eight Chinese were killed by marines who came ashore from foreign gunboats. That made the fires burn still more intensely. On June 23rd there occurred in the city of Canton the greatest tragedy of all. There was a procession of possibly twenty thousand people, two thousand Chinese soldiers occupying a place in the procession. They were marching along the Bund opposite the little island of Shameen, separated from the city by a creek about a hundred feet wide. This island is a settlement of Britain. While the

procession was passing somebody fired a shot. Nobody to this day knows who fired the shot, or on which side it was fired. All that we know is that somebody fired it, and then other shots followed, and the result was that a Frenchman was killed, three Britons were wounded, two Japanese were wounded and one Frenchman, while fifty-two Chinese were killed and a hundred and seventeen were wounded. This tragedy was talked about everywhere in China. A fire had been kindled that will not soon be put out.

You remember that one day in the city of Boston some Americans gathered around a few British redcoats in King Street, jeering them and saying sarcastic things about them, whereupon the British opened fire and a half dozen Americans lay dead. That is known in the history of this country as the " Boston Massacre." It was on a day in early spring, men lay on the ground, their blood oozing out upon the snow, and that blood set the heart of America ablaze. It was the Boston Massacre that precipitated the Revolutionary War. And so the blood shed in Shanghai and Hangkow and Nanking and Canton has set four hundred million people on fire, and the ultimate result no one can see. We only know that just as the Boston Massacre led to a train of events which set the American people free, so the massacre in Shanghai on the 30th day of May, 1925, has released forces which will ultimately set China free.

This, then, is the present situation. The West has discovered the logical outcome of its policy. All the nations of the West are today in a humble and almost repentant mood. It is amazing with what alacrity Great Britain has come down from her high horse. You would hardly know the Great Britain of today, if you had seen the actions of the Great Britain of twenty years ago. Her policy has changed, her mood has altered. The voices that now come out of Downing Street are as soft and gentle as the notes of cooing doves. The attitude of Great Britain has changed, and so also has the attitude of the United States. At the Washington Conference in 1922 our Government did something to right some of the wrongs that China has been obliged to suffer, and last January our Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg, publicly proclaimed the readiness of our Government to join with other governments in revising the unequal treaties, and went on to say something which our Government had never said before, that if we could not act with other countries, we were willing to go ahead and act alone. All of the governments now are ready to revise the treaties and make radical changes in the tariff policy, but at this point they are faced by an insurmountable difficulty. There is no national government in China. There is no government to formulate any treaty. If the extraterritorial rights are to be given up there is no government to whom they can be given. If the

tariff policy is to be altered there is no government to alter it. The governments of the West are saying to the Chinese people, " As soon as you have a stable government, then we are willing to give up all the rights that do not belong to us. As soon as you have a government that will insure us security for our lives and security for our property, then we are ready to revise all the treaties. Give us some assurance that we shall receive justice in your courts and we will take our own courts away. Give us assurance that our nationals will not be thrown into your barbarous jails and subjected to infamous torture, and we will surrender all the privileges which the treaties have given us." But alas, there is no government. There is no government which can speak with authority. There is no government which can insure order. The nations of the West are compelled, therefore, to stand waiting. There are two hundred and eighty-three thousand foreigners in China, and twelve thousand of these are Americans. As soon as China has a stable government we are willing to revise the treaties and to cease doing the things which China resents.

And what do the Chinese people say in response to all this? They say, " We cannot set up a stable government because of your constant interference in our affairs. We have no money to support a stable government because you will not allow us to collect tariff customs over five per cent. How

can we have a government which will be respected if we cannot collect money sufficient to pay the running expenses? And, moreover, how can we set our house in order so long as these foreign settlements exist? They are hot-beds for political insurrections. They are houses of refuge for all of our political malcontents and rogues. In these settlements conspiracies against the government are hatched, and into these all political mischief-makers run for protection. How can we set our house in order? Not until these settlements are surrendered. And, therefore, when it comes to giving up extra-territorial privileges, we ask you to give them up at once. You have taken a long while about giving them up, and now we say, 'Give them up at once.' We say, 'Give them up without conditions.' You have always put in an 'if.' You have said 'if,' you will do thus and thus, then we are willing to do and so. But we are not willing to listen to any 'ifs.' Extra-territorial privileges never belonged to you, and therefore we want you to give them up without conditions." And thus, you see, that the East and West are in an impasse. What a mess it is! How we shall get out of it nobody knows.

There are many Chinese who feel that we ought to recognize the Kuomintang, the Cantonese party. Just at present that party is victorious under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek. The Cantonese army has swept everything before it until now a

considerable proportion of China lies under its sway. Why not recognize Chiang Kai-shek and make negotiations with him? It is not so easy as it looks. He is a rebel against the Peking government, and the Peking government is the only national, lawful government in China. It is not a wise thing for an outside nation to take sides in time of civil war. We once fought a civil war in this country, and it was hazardous for foreign nations to take sides. Great Britain came within one of taking sides with the Confederacy, and she paid dearly for her carelessness. Later on, down to the present hour, there is deep resentment in many American hearts because of what Britain did in the days of our national peril. Nobody knows how Chiang Kai-shek is coming out. He is victorious today. He may be defeated tomorrow. When I was in Shanghai last April one of the leading men in China was Marshal Sun Chuan-fang. He was the ruler of five provinces, the virtual king of one hundred and thirteen million people, as many people as we have in the United States. I counted him one of the sanest and ablest of all the men in China, and now he lies low, and no one so poor to do him reverence. He is completely down and out. That is the way things happen in China. You cannot tell on one day what is coming on the morrow, and therefore our Government cannot in wisdom recognize either party in a Chinese civil war.

One thing of which I am certain is that the Chinese people will get out of all their troubles. They have often been in a hole before and they have gotten out of every one of them. They will get out of this one. They have often been between the devil and the deep sea, but every time they have made their escape. They will escape this time. I do not know how, but they will escape. I have immeasurable confidence in the people. They are the most cheerful people on the earth. I saw more happy faces in the Chinese cities than in the cities of any other country. They are industrious. There are no such workers anywhere else in the world. They will work longer hours and under harder conditions than the people of any other race. When I asked Admiral Sah what made the Chinese people so happy, his swift reply was, "They are happy because they work so hard.' They are peaceable. They hate war. They hate their military lords. They believe in reason. They are lovable. They are gentle, affectionate and courteous. Nearly all American tourists agree that they are the most lovable people they have ever seen. Singularly enough, they are in many ways more like Americans than any other people of the Far East. The structure of their mind seems to be like the structure of our own. They have our sense of humour. We laugh at the same things. If a thing is funny to us it is funny to a Chinese also. They are intensely prac-

tical. They are not dreamers or visionaries. They keep both feet upon the earth. Moreover, they are reasonable. When Dr. Arthur Smith was asked what was the outstanding characteristic of the Chinese people, he said, " Reasonableness." They are always ready to reason. They resent dictation. They despise force. They do not want to hold any position which cannot be defended by the reason. That is why they are quarrelling today with the Christian nations of the West. They say, " You would not allow our gunboats to be in your rivers and lakes. You insist that yours shall be in ours. That is not reasonable. You would not allow us to dictate your tariff policy, and yet you dictate ours. That is not reasonable. You have your guards around the legation quarters in our capital. You would not allow us to keep our guards in Washington City. You are not reasonable." It is because they believe in reason and we believe in reason that we and they will some day get together.

I cannot close without facing the question, " What shall we do? " Permit me to suggest three things. We Americans can certainly feel sympathy with and good will toward the Chinese people. They are in great distress. Our hearts should go out to them. Their republic is only a baby. It is trying to walk. It has made the effort again and again. Every time it gets up it falls. It has cut its head. It is bleeding. Its face is covered with

blood. It is no longer able to walk. It is crawling. It is crawling over ground wet with its blood. We ought to sympathize with the Chinese people. There are scenes that come back to me again and again. I shall never forget the Chinese refugees—old women and little children driven from their country homes which had been looted by soldiers, driven into the city, to be given just food enough to keep them from starving. Poor people! We ought to give them our sympathy and affection.

And I think we ought to express it. I see no reason why our President should not express it. Why should he not speak for us? He has no right to speak on behalf of the Government, but he can speak for the people. There is no precedent, but what of that? He would shock some people should he do it, but why should not a president be brave enough to do a new thing if it be a beautiful thing? How it would thrill the world if the President of the greatest of the world's republics should say to the people of the Chinese Republic how deeply we sympathize with them in their tribulations, and how enthusiastically we are with them in their political aspirations.

And, then, I wish our Government would do something. Our Government could say things to the Chinese minister in Washington. He is a representative of the Peking Government, and therefore may be assumed to be a representative of the Chinese people. I wish our Congress would say

to the Chinese minister that we are ready to bring our marines home, and our soldiers home. I wish Congress would say to the Chinese minister that we are ready to grant tariff autonomy, and grant it now. We will not wait until 1929. We will grant it now. I wish our Congress would say to him that we are ready to revise all the treaties and to do it now, and to give up all our extra-territorial privileges, and to give them up now. I wish the House and the Senate would unite in assuring the Chinese minister that we are ready to treat China in every respect like an equal. That is certainly a noble thing for the government of a Christian country to say. There is nothing I desire so much for my country as this, that it should "do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly before God."

IV

THE JAPANESE PROBLEM

MY subject is the problem of Japan. That is an ambiguous expression and must be explained. One can use the title in two different ways. Japan has a problem, a problem all her own which she must grapple with, and with courage and patience work out. But Japan not only has a problem, she also presents a problem. She presents a problem to China. China, in considering the list of her problems, counts the Japanese problem one of them. Japan presents a problem to Russia. Russian statesmen, in adding up the Russian problems, include the Japanese problem in the list. She presents to us a problem. We have many problems to consider, and the Japanese problem is one of the most interesting of them all. We find that whenever we take up a national problem and begin to unroll it, it turns out to be a world problem. The nations are so closely interrelated that the problem of each one of them sends its roots down into the problem of all mankind. I ask you, then, to think not only of the problem which Japan has on her hands, but

Delivered April 7, 1927.

also of the problem which other nations have on their hands because the Japanese Empire exists.

I do not set myself up as an expert on Japan. I am nothing but an interpreter. I am not learned in Japanese history or Japanese art or Japanese commerce or Japanese literature. It is hard for Europeans to see us Americans as we are. They see us through a haze and therefore indistinctly. Some of them get a very distorted image of us because of the flaws in the medium through which they see us. That medium is the daily press, and rumours and gossip. It is also hard for Americans to see Europe as it is. Most Americans see Europe through a haze and many Americans have lamentably distorted notions of what Europe really is. There is great need for interpreters, men who can interpret Europe to America and America to Europe. They need to understand each other better. We cannot secure international understanding and good will without further and clearer knowledge.

It is hard for Asiatics to see Americans as they are. They look at us not through a mist but through a fog. Sometimes they do not see anything at all. Many of them see only a distorted image of us. Millions of Orientals have twisted and ludicrous notions of what Occidentals are. But it is also hard for Americans to see Asiatics as they are. We also gaze through a fog, and some of us do not see much when we look into

the Far East. The image of the Oriental is distorted for us in a most amazing manner. We are in need of interpreters, men who can interpret the East to the West and the West to the East.

When one starts out to speak about a foreign country he is certain to slide down into a depressing humility. He realizes his limitations. He is amazed by the size of the literature that has been produced, and he is humbled by the knowledge that there are a large number of people in his city who have lived long in the country about which he is going to lecture, and who know immeasurably more about it than he knows. When I think of the hundreds of books which I ought to have read before giving this lecture, and when I think of the hundreds of people in New York who know Japan a hundred times better than I do, I feel like sitting down and remaining silent for seven days.

But I comfort myself by thinking that I possess a few qualifications which fit me to act as an interpreter. First of all, I have sympathy with the Japanese. I do not come to them cold-heartedly but sympathetically, and therefore I can better understand them than people can who have no sympathy. I am blessed with a good imagination. I can with great ease throw myself into another man's place, understand his viewpoint, think as he thinks, and feel as he feels. It is not hard for me to put myself in the place of a Japanese and see

the world through Japanese eyes. Moreover, I am a friend of the Japanese. People who dislike them cannot understand them. We never understand anybody whom we dislike. I am fond of the Japanese, and therefore I see in them ever so many beautiful things. My fondness for them gives me great courage when I speak about them. I speak not only of their virtues but also of their faults. There are some Britons and also some Americans who have idealized the Japanese. They have pictured them as angels and archangels, and have represented Japan as a sort of paradise. I never did that. The Japanese people are very much like the rest of us. They are a mixture of good and bad. Japan has in it a great jumble of wisdom and foolishness.

In other words, Japan and America are much alike. There are some people who are always saying that they have no use for the Japanese. One reason they give is that the Japanese are so "bumptious." "They are conceited and cocky." "They are stuck on themselves." No doubt some Japanese are, but that ought not to surprise us. There are Americans who are stuck on themselves. A man who is stuck on himself is contemptible, whether he be an American or a Japanese. When we talk about Japanese being bumptious we ought to remember that that is not a new species of human beings but an old species with which we have been acquainted all our life. Some say they

have no use for the Japanese because "they are so tricky; they are dishonest, they are all rogues at heart." These people go on to tell you that the Japanese do not trust one another, that the Japanese banks employ Chinese tellers because they cannot trust their own countrymen. If you mention that to any American missionary in Japan he will go wild. It is a lie made out of whole cloth. There is not a shred of truth in it. A long while ago some one offered a thousand dollars to the man who would point out a solitary Chinese teller in any Japanese-controlled bank in all Japan. No one has yet appeared to claim the reward. The bank-clerk lie is one of the most popular lies against the Japanese. It is a lie through and through, and yet it lives on. It is amazing how long-lived a lie is, and how difficult it is to kill it. Inside of a month, I doubt not, some of you will be hearing again that the Japanese always employ Chinese tellers in their banks.

It is not true that all Japanese are rogues. Some are. Some are tricky. Some are liars and cheats. But that ought not to surprise us Americans. It only shows that we do not have a monopoly of all the rogues in the world. Some say they have no use for the Japanese because they are militaristic, they believe in war, they are always eager to fight. When I hear people say that I say to myself, "Not all Japanese are militaristic." Japan has thousands of ardent lovers

of peace. I know what the militarists of Japan are. There are no bigger fools in the world than they. When I was in Japan I said again and again to Japanese audiences, that some of the biggest fools on the earth live in Japan. I hastened to tell them that we also had fools that could match theirs. The Japanese jingoist is one of the most disgusting of all jingoists to be found anywhere. Mr. Stoddard, in his book entitled *The Rising Tide of Colour,* brings together a number of quotations from Japanese militarists, and you are amazed that any human beings should be able to degenerate into such chattering idiots. I have been reading the sayings of militarists for the last thirty years, and so you cannot tell me anything new about the militarists of Japan. But all Japanese are not militarists. Prince Yamagata was a militarist of the first order, but Prince Tokugawa is a man of an entirely different temper. Hasagawa was almost a fiend incarnate, but Admiral Saito is one of the noblest and sweetest spirited men I have ever met. Because I am the friend of Japanese I do not hesitate to condemn them when they do what I think is wrong.

They committed a colossal blunder in 1915 when their government issued its Twenty-one Demands on China. Nothing that Japan has done in the last twenty years has shaken the confidence of so many people in her reasonableness and humanity as those twenty-one demands. They are spots

upon her hand. Many people say, "Ah, look at the twenty-one demands. There you get an exhibition of the genuine Japanese mind. That is what you must expect when you are dealing with the Japanese people." My reply is, that that is not an exhibition of the normal Japanese mind. That is an exhibition of the militaristic Japanese mind. In 1915 a military clique was in the saddle in Japan. Kato was the chief leader in those days. He was a militarist to the marrow of his bones, and the militaristic mind is always a stupid mind. As Walter Hines Page said in the midst of the Great War, "Militarism has no judgment." That is universally true. Militarism never has any judgment. The militaristic mind has no insight, and no grip on what Bismarck called the "Imponderables." But Kato is dead and nobler men of a different temper have taken his place. Japan is not militaristic. The majority of Japanese are not militarists. The majority of them are lovers of peace.

One other qualification as an interpreter I have, and that is a certain measure of first-hand knowledge of the Japanese people. I should never have been bold enough to have given this lecture had I not spent a month in Japan last year. I have travelled from Shimonoseki to Matsushima, that is from one end to the other of the largest of their islands. I have seen her representative cities such as Kobe and Osaka and Kyoto and Tokyo and Yoko-

hama. I have seen several of her smaller cities, including Nikko and Narra and Sendai and Kamakura. I have seen thousands of her people working in the fields, and tens of thousands of her people in the city streets. I have seen thousands of her boys and girls on hikes walking from temple to temple and from beauty spot to beauty spot, drinking in the loveliness of the country in the springtime, going home to write essays and poems on the things they saw and enjoyed. I have seen thousands of young men and young women in their colleges and schools. I have spoken to them and have gotten the same response from them that I get when I speak to young people in our own country. I have preached to congregations in her churches. It is my conviction that the Japanese mind and the American mind are closely akin to each other. American Christians and Japanese Christians are exceedingly close to one another. We sing the same hymns and offer the same prayers, and look up to the same revelation of God in Christ. I have talked with many of her most illustrious men—Viscounts, Marquises and Barons. I have sat with some of them at their own table, and because I have had these opportunities of bringing my mind into contact with the Japanese mind I dare to speak to you on the Japanese problem.

Let us think for a few minutes about the problem which Japan has on her hands. The question

which Japan has to face is how to find space for her population and how to secure her people food enough to eat. Japan is a very small country, almost incredibly small. It is 10,000 square miles less in area than our State of California. California has 158,000 square miles and Japan only 148,000. If you add Korea and Formosa and Saghalien you have a total area of 260,000 square miles, but even that is over 5,000 square miles less than our single State of Texas. But although Old Japan has an area of only 148,000 square miles she has in that area 60,000,000 people, sixteen times as many as live in the State of California. The density of her population, if you drop out her northern islands, is 486 to the square mile. That means her density of population is two and a half times that of France and far greater than that of Germany or Italy or England. Our density of population is thirty-six to the square mile. In other words, the population of Japan is thirteen times denser than it is in our own country, and to make matters still more perplexing her population increases at the rate of 600,000 a year. Where are there people going to find space enough to live in? That is a puzzling question. And where are they going to get enough to eat? Only twenty-six per cent. of the land in Japan can be cultivated. So much of it is rocky and so much of it is sandy that only a little over a quarter of it can be tilled. In Germany and France over sixty

per cent. can be tilled. In Italy three-quarters can be tilled, and in England more than three-quarters. In Japan every square foot is made use of. The little farms are almost pathetic in their smallness, they are laid out so minutely and so artistically. Everything is so neat and so beautiful you feel that you are looking upon a specimen of delicate needlework such as women do. Again and again you will see some little garden planted on the side of a rock. There was a handful of soil there and some poor soul has been obliged to cultivate it in order to keep himself from starving. They are getting out of the soil all that it is possible to get out of it. They have farmed their land intensively and they have studied the art and science of fertilization with diligence, and it is not possible for them to go any further. With all their industry and science it is not possible to get out of the soil food sufficient to feed her people, and therefore she must become an industrial nation. An agricultural civilization is not possible. But Japan is poor in natural resources. She has only a little coal and most of it is unfit for use in her blast furnaces. She has very little iron. She must depend almost entirely on foreign countries for her iron and steel. She has only a little oil, about half enough to supply her industrial needs. Where is she going to get raw materials which form the basis of an industrial civilization?

There is only one thing to do. Some of her

people must emigrate. Four hundred thousand of them have already gone into Korea, 200,000 into Formosa, 200,000 into Manchuria, 120,000 into Saghalien, 110,000 into Hawaii, 111,000 have come to this country, about 50,000 have gone into China. But this gives only temporary relief. Where is Japan's surplus population to go? She is all dressed up in Western clothes and has nowhere to go. There is no open door in all the West. Her people cannot come into the United States, nor into British Columbia, nor into Australia, nor into New Zealand. They cannot go into China because China is already overpopulated, nor into the East Indies, for most of these islands are overcrowded. There is only one open door, and that is the door opening into Manchuria, but in that direction there are obstacles and many dangers; and so it would seem that Japan's problem is well-nigh insoluble. I have sketched the problem for you so that you may look at it. That is the problem which Japanese statesmen have to consider. That is the problem which every thoughtful Japanese is obliged to turn over in his mind. It is a kind of problem which we Americans have never known anything about. Imagine, if you can, what life and the world would seem if we were face to face with a problem such as that. I ask you to look at it. I am sure if you look at it long enough you will find your heart becoming increasingly sympathetic toward Japan.

Let us now turn to the problem which Japan presents to us. There are three phases of the Japanese-American problem. The first phase is the Philippine phase. How are we going to prevent Japan from taking the Philippines? The second phase is the California phase. How are we going to keep the Japanese from making an economic invasion of our country? The third phase is the Manchuria phase. How can we check the advance of Japan in Manchuria and compel her to recognize our principle of the open door? To these three phases of the American-Japanese problem I now invite your attention.

We shall not spend much time on the Philippine phase of the problem for the reason that this has the least in it to disturb us. The most tragic result of our coming into possession of the Philippines is the fact that that plays into the hands of the militarists in both countries. Certain Japanese are always railing at the fact that we are in the Philippines. They say that our presence there proves that we are an imperialistic nation. We prate a great deal about liberty, but we do not believe in liberty except for white men. We have no regard whatever for the liberties of coloured men. We gobbled up Hawaii to start with at a critical period in the history of those islands. We landed marines from our gunboats, supported an insurrectionary government, and hastily railroaded through Congress a bill of annexation, making

Hawaii a part of the United States. Later on we took possession of the Philippines on the plea that we wanted to train them for self-government, and there is now no telling what we are going to do next. We are an imperialistic nation, and we have entered upon a policy of economic expansion. Therefore let Japan beware, there is nothing for Japan to do but prepare for a war which will inevitably come. Japan must have compulsory military drill. All the boys of Japan must be taught to shoot. Japan must have a navy, a big navy, to defend her coasts, for the United States has broken into the Eastern Hemisphere and there is no telling what her next step will be. That is the way the Japanese militarists think and talk.

And now let us listen to the militarists of our own country. "Keep your eye on Japan. She is overpopulated and underfed. She has already taken Formosa and Korea, and she is doing her very best to get possession of Manchuria. She will take the Philippines the first chance she gets. The only thing for us to do is to keep a powerful navy. She is a treacherous enemy and she will strike us when we are off our guard. We must keep our navy up to the highest pitch of efficiency." And so through the last twenty-five years we have expended billions of dollars on our navy, the chief reason being that we must have a navy to keep Japan from stealing the Philippines. That is what the militarists always do, they play upon

fear. They do it in every country, and their trick works like a charm. You can paralyze the reason by making the heart afraid. That is the trump card which the militarists always play. They work their will by filling the heart with fears.

Now, in my view, there has never been the slightest danger of Japan taking the Philippines, nor is there the slightest danger of her attempting to take them today. She does not want them. Her people do not like to live there. The islands were discovered in 1521. They have been open for over four hundred years, and yet at the end of four hundred years there are only about eight thousand Japanese in all the Philippine Islands. They do not like to go there. You cannot drive them there. The country is too hot. The Japanese do not like hot weather, and therefore they hate the Philippines. The government of Japan does not want the Philippines. The government has already more problems on its hands than it can easily manage. Formosa bristles with problems and so also does Korea, and the government has never shown the slightest inclination to reach out a hand in the direction of the Philippines.

Moreover, Japan would never dare to fight for the Philippines. If we offered to give them to her as a gift she might accept them, but she certainly would never fight to get them. She could not afford to fight to get them, for if she should get into war with us, that would give Red Russia a chance to

come down upon her. So long as Russia crouches at her back door she dare not fight us, and therefore the danger of losing the Philippines is a bogey. It is brought out by the militarists every year at the time of voting the naval appropriations. Only recently our General Navy Board recommended the expenditure of a hundred and ten million dollars for new defenses in the Pacific. Why new defenses in the Pacific? Who has any war vessels there? Only one nation, and that is Japan, and therefore our Navy Board wants a hundred and ten millions more for new defenses against Japan. The Philippine peril is a bugaboo, and there is nothing more astonishing to me in the whole round world than the gullibility of thousands of American men and women on this subject. As P. T. Barnum used to say, "People do love to be gulled." The people who imagine that Japan is eager to take the Philippines are simply allowing themselves to be gulled.

Let us now pass on to the California situation, which is far more complex and more worth our attention. It is important that all Americans should understand it, and it is equally important that all Japanese should understand it, too. I am happy that we have a goodly number of Japanese with us tonight, because what I have to say is intended fully as much for them as for our own people. There are three dates which it will be a good thing for us to hold in our mind. The first

is 1906. In that year the School Board of the city of San Francisco passed a vote to segregate the Japanese school children. They were to be allowed no longer to sit in the same school rooms with white children. That caused a great stir in the hearts of the Japanese. The situation was so threatening that President Roosevelt appointed a conference with the Mayor of San Francisco. They talked the whole matter over, and the final outcome was the "Gentleman's Agreement." The Japanese Ambassador promised our Secretary of State that the Japanese Government would issue no more passports for coolies to this country. It was never put down on paper. It was not embodied in a treaty. It was just a word of honour passed from one government to another. For that reason it is known as the "Gentleman's Agreement." That "Gentleman's Agreement" continued in force down to 1924. The second date to be remembered is 1913. In that year the first Alien Land Ownership Law was passed. According to that law it became impossible for Japanese to own land in California or even to lease land. Similar laws were passed in a few other Western States. That stirred a new comotion in the Japanese heart.

The next date to be remembered is 1924. In the month of May of that year the Congress of the United States passed an immigration law containing an exclusion clause, shutting out all Asiatics from this country except students and tourists and

a few others. The commotion this time became a storm. Most Americans did not think much about the passage of this Exclusion Act. We are always busy with our own affairs, and it did not occur to us that the Japanese would suffer so intensely because of what our Congress had done. I confess it was a revelation to me to discover on my arrival in Japan that the Japanese heart was bleeding so profusely. Viscount Shebusawa, who for fifty years has been our steadfast friend, always working day and night for a closer concord between the two peoples, was so shocked and saddened by the passage of the Act, that he took to his bed and was unable to get up for a week, and some of his friends despaired of his life, thinking he was going to die of a broken heart.

I sat one day at the dinner table in the home of Baron Okura, another grand old man of Japan. He is one of the wealthiest men of the country. In the Tokyo fire he lost his elegant art museum. He had spent fifty years of his life collecting these treasures. He had spent millions of dollars upon it, and in one night it went up in smoke. But I could tell when I talked to him that the loss of his art gallery was nothing compared to what he suffered over the passage of our Exclusion Act. The earthquake and fire occurred on the first of September, 1923. It was eight months later that Congress passed the Exclusion Act. Japan is recovering from the shock of the earthquake and fire, but

she is not recovering from the shock of the Exclusion Act. Her heart is bleeding day and night. Viscount Shebusawa says that the resentment is just as deep and intense now as on the day when the Act was passed, but the Japanese are a quiet folk. They do not shout from the housetop. They are not making any spectacular demonstration. They are stoics. They suffer in silence, but if you have acute ears you can hear the blood dripping drop by drop from hearts that have been cut deep.

Let me now give you the two sides of the California matter. There are always two sides to every question, and it is very important that we get both sides of this one. Let me present the Japanese side first. The Japanese concede that it is our right to control the composition of our population. Every nation claims the right to do that. We have a right to put restrictions upon our immigration according to our own desires. The Japanese do not deny that right. But the Japanese look upon this matter as one involving their honour. Japan is one of the five great powers. By the sheer force of her genius she won that high place. Little by little she climbed up and took her place by the side of Britain and France and Germany and the United States, the acknowledged peer of the great countries of the West. And now we pass an Exclusion Act shutting her people out from our country. We would not treat Britons so, nor

Frenchmen so, nor Germans so. We treat yellow men in a way different from the way in which we treat white men. That is why her heart is sore. Moreover, in the Great War she was our ally. She threw her men and her money into that great contest and helped to win the victory for the allies, and now at the end of the War when one would have expected some manifestation of gratitude we suddenly decide that her people shall not be allowed to come into our country. We allow the Turk to come. The Turk may own land, and the Turk may become a citizen. The Turk was our enemy all through the War. He played the part of a barbarian, yes, the part of a savage, but nevertheless we allow him to come in. The Japanese, our ally, cannot come in. Even the Zulu and the Hottentot from Africa can come. They can own land. They can become citizens, but the Japanese cannot become a citizen. He cannot own land. That is why the heart of Japan is bleeding.

We have a quota law. According to this law a certain number of immigrants from each nation can be admitted, the number being a certain per cent. of the people from that country already here. According to the quota law about a hundred Japanese could come in, but we were not willing to apply the quota law to them. We said we will not allow even a hundred to come in. We will not allow one to come in. We do not want any Japan-

ese at all. That is why the Japanese heart is bleeding. Japan asks only for equal treatment. She does not object to any test that we may choose to apply, provided the same test is applied to all nations. We can make any property test we wish. We can make any educational test we desire. We can make any age test, or any character test which satisfies us, and she will be satisfied, too, provided that test is applied to all men alike. But we have plainly said that no matter how much money a Japanese may possess, or how good an education he may have, or how noble a man he may be, we do not want him in this country. That is why the heart of Japan is bleeding. And then we hurt her still more deeply by the manner in which the law was passed. We did it so brusquely, so boorishly. We did not talk the matter over with her. We scrapped the " Gentleman's Agreement " without a word of explanation. We not only shut the door, we slammed it in her face. We said nothing expressive of our regret. While the question was under discussion in Congress the Japanese Ambassador, Mr. Hanihara, said that the passage of the law might be followed by " grave consequences." That expression, " Grave consequences," was caught up at once by the barbarians of the public press and exploited as a threat of war. The idea of war never entered into the Ambassador's heart. He was not thinking of war. No sensible Japanese thinks of war in connection

with the California strife. What the Ambassador meant was that if that law was passed there would be a wound inflicted on a friendly heart. That, to him, was a grave consequence. To many Americans it was of no consequence worth taking into account. Japan has never for a moment desired to force her people upon us. She would never do a boorish think like that. She is proud and sensitive, and the question of Japanese immigration is to her a question of honour. Her heart is bleeding because she feels we have insulted her. We have told her to her face that we consider the Japanese inferior, and therefore must not be allowed to stand on the same level with even the Turks. That is the Japanese side of the question.

And now let us look at the American side. I assure our Japanese friends there is an American side. It is very important that the Japanese should see this side. When I was in Japan I felt that many of the Japanese there did not see the American side at all, and I wished I could stay several months in order to explain to them the American position.

The first fact to be taken into consideration is that the people of California do not want any more Japanese there. There are already 72,000 there, and many Californians feel that that is enough. They have expressed their feelings again and again. There is no doubt whatever as to how the average Californian feels. We on the Atlantic seaboard

cannot understand the feelings of the Californians. They are filled with a great dread of the Oriental. They are afraid if the door is left open even a little that California will be swamped under an Oriental flood, and therefore they do not want any more Japanese to come. Our Government cannot compel the people in California to want the Japanese. We cannot compel California to treat the Japanese politely. We cannot compel her to treat Japanese even decently. Our National Government cannot compel a State to do what the State does not want to do. At the present hour the great Empire State of New York does not want to enforce the Volstead Act, and the United States Government cannot compel New York to do what our people do not want to do. Our Japanese friends must realize that we have a country whose government is so constructed that the States have certain rights which the National Government cannot take away.

For instance, in 1906, when President Roosevelt became alarmed over the California situation he did not dictate to the Mayor of San Francisco. The President of the United States can dictate to no Mayor. The Mayor represents his own city and will always stand on his dignity and his rights. All that the President could do was to hold a conference with the Mayor, and by talking the question over, they arrived at an amicable conclusion. In 1913, President Wilson was much opposed to

the passage of the Alien Land Law in California. So also was his Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Bryan did their utmost to keep the California legislature from passing that law, but a legislature has a right to pass what laws it will, and even the President of the United States is impotent when it comes to coercing a State Legislature. In 1924, both the President, Mr. Coolidge, and the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, felt it was unwise to pass the Exclusion Act in the form in which it was passed. They felt that the end desired could be achieved in a better way, but Congress is not willing to listen to a President and his chief adviser at all times, and the result was that the Exclusion Act was passed. This, then, is the first fact to be borne in mind, that the United States Government cannot coerce a State to do what the State does not want to do.

The second fact to be remembered is that we cannot afford to introduce a cause of chronic strife into our country. We have enough turmoil already without increasing the amount. We want to be a happy family. We are not very happy, but we do not want to be more unhappy than we already are. Now, if we cannot introduce Japanese into a part of our country without stirring up the community and filling people's minds with bitterness and ill-will, then we had better not allow those people to come in.

The third fact to be borne in mind is that we

have shut the Japanese out, not because they are inferior but because they are different. There is no doubt that they and we are different. Occidentals and Orientals have a different background. They have grown up under different traditions. They have developed different institutions. They have different standards of life. It does not follow from this that one is inferior to the other. Frenchmen and Germans are not alike. It does not follow that Frenchmen are superior to Germans, or that Germans are superior to Frenchmen. Italians and Englishmen are not alike. It does not follow that Italians are superior to Englishmen, or that Englishmen are superior to Italians. Japanese and Americans are not alike. It does not follow that either side is superior to the other. We only know that we are unlike. And since we are unlike we cannot run the risk of jeopardizing our standards and our institutions. Representative government has never flourished anywhere except in Anglo-Saxon countries. It is a difficult form of government to run. We are not sure yet whether we ourselves are going to succeed in running it or not. There are many complications and many perils, and we do not want to run any unnecessary risks at the present critical stage in political evolution. We do not know what might be the ultimate effect upon representative government in California if the number of Japanese should be indefinitely increased. We are trying a daring

experiment in democracy, and just now we do not want to increase the risks of failure. Moreover, the Japanese are more industrious than Americans. They work fourteen and sixteen hours a day and do not seem to be hurt by it. They are used to it. But Americans growl if they have to work eight hours a day. Now, to introduce into a community men who are willing to work sixteen hours a day in competition with men who are willing to work only eight hours a day, upsets the whole standard of living and reduces the community to social chaos. Moreover, the Japanese are a wonderfully prolific race. They would easily outpopulate the white stock in California in a few decades. Besides all this, there are 800,000,000 human beings on the continent of Asia. Most of them are poor and most of them are ignorant, and if a full-sized stream of immigration should once set in toward America, who knows what might be the ultimate outcome. We have not to treat all Asiatics alike. We cannot draw a distinction between Japanese and Chinese, and we cannot draw a distinction between Chinese and Indians. There is only one point at which the line can safely be drawn. We can exclude all Asiatics or we cannot exclude any. It is by no means certain that it is not best both for the Japanese and the Americans that there should be at the present time no large influx of the Japanese into this country.

In the year 1892, Mr. Herbert Spencer, the great

English philosopher, wrote a letter to Count Ito, the Premier of Japan, in which he gave the Count this advice. "The Japanese policy should, I think, be that of keeping Americans and Europeans as much as possible at arm's length." He was a student of sociology, and a profound thinker, and his knowledge of the history of the world convinced him that it would be a good thing for Japanese to keep Americans and Europeans at arm's length. That would no doubt be his advice to us in our dealing with the Japanese. It would be good both for them and for us to keep at arm's length from each other. Here, then, I leave the argument.

I think the Japanese are right when they say it is not a closed incident. America has not spoken the final word in this Exclusion Act. We are passing through a troubled period, and possibly, everything considered, that Exclusion Act was the wisest thing that could be done. But if there is anything unfair in it or anything that works to the hurt of humanity, the wrong will be righted. I have great confidence in the generosity and the justice of the American people. We commit many blunders. We are guilty of many sins. I am ashamed of our record. Again and again I comfort myself by falling back on the conviction that the American people down in their heart are everlastingly generous and just.

We are now ready to look at the Manchurian phase of the question. This is a phase that does

not often get into the newspapers, and of which most Americans are ignorant, but it is really the most important phase of the three, one that will later on generate the most fever, one which is most prolific in perils. As I have already said, there is only one door toward which Japanese can make their way, and that is the door which opens into Manchuria. Manchuria is a big country. It is two and a half times the size of old Japan, and has a population of only 20,000,000. It is very rich in raw products. It is just the kind of country which the Japanese people need. But America has announced her policy as the policy of "the open door." That means that nobody shall have any advantages granted them in Asia that are not granted also to the United States. We insist on the open door in Asia. We do not believe in the open door in America. We believe in keeping the door closed. We even padlock the door. We repudiate the idea of the open door here at home, over in Manchuria we believe in it. We believe that every door in Asia should be wide open so that every American can go in when he will. American business men and corporations are taking great interest in Manchuria. They are running races with the Japanese. They are very envious of the Japanese when the Japanese gets the slightest advantage. The Japanese Government invested a hundred thousand lives and a billion dollars in cash in her effort to save Manchuria

from the clutches of Russia, but Secretary Knox, notwithstanding the great investment of Japan, suggested the idea of internationalizing all the railroads of Manchuria so that Japan should not have any advantage over any other nation whatsoever. We do business in all parts of the world. One would suppose we could afford to keep out of Manchuria, but our big business men are determined to make money there. But when it comes to Japanese doing business we do not want them to do business anywhere outside of Japan. We do not want them to come into our country, and we get very uneasy when any of them go into Mexico. If a few Japanese secure a little spot anywhere on the coast of Mexico, our papers shriek and howl, declaring that the Japanese Government is trying to found a naval base. If a little group of Japanese farmers try to lease some land in Central America, our newspapers foam at the mouth, declaring that the Japanese Government is trying to establish a foothold on the American continent. If any company of Japanese business men try to establish a business of any sort in Brazil, or in any other South American country, a great hubbub is immediately raised because the Japanese Government is endeavouring to get a strangle hold on the civilization of the New World. And yet we go everywhere. Henry Ford goes everywhere. The Standard Oil goes everywhere. The Steel Corporation goes every-

where. The Firestone Rubber Company has recently leased a hundred million acres of land in Liberia. We build railroads everywhere, operate mines, develop farm lands everywhere, plant rubber trees everywhere, but we are not willing that the Japanese should go anywhere. Let them stay at home! We will travel twelve thousand miles to beat her out in the one little corner of Northeastern Asia where she might find an opening for her people and her commerce. This is the darkest and most depressing phase of the American-Japanese problem.

And now, in conclusion, what are we going to do about it? I do not like to close a lecture without speaking at least a few constructive words. Let me offer three suggestions:

We might cultivate the art of courtesy. We might endeavour to perfect ourselves in the practice of good manners. We are not a polite people. We are not as polite as the Oriental. After travelling through China I came away deeply impressed by the fact that the Chinese are a far more courteous people than we are—more gentle, more courteous. That is the feeling I brought away with me also from Japan. Even though we have slammed the door in their face and even though they knew I was an American, they treated me with the most beautiful courtesy. We ought to take lessons in the art of courtesy. We ought to send the editors of some of our papers to school

in order that they may learn the A B C's of decency. We ought to send some of our congressmen to school in order that they may learn how to use the language of gentlemen. We ought to send all our people to school, that they may take a course of lessons in good manners.

I hope that one of the results of this lecture will be a new determination on your part to go out of your way to be kind to the Japanese in this country. Our Government has slammed the door in the face of their people, but you can be kind to the students and the tourists and the merchants here. When they go back to their home they will carry in their hearts memories of Americans who were courteous and kind.

We can frown down all talk of war with Japan. When people talk about such a war let us utter our protest. Let us speak boldly. Why should we be timid? All such talk is mischievous. Let us banish it from the land so far as we are able. There must never be any war with Japan. War with Japan is incredible. War with Japan is unthinkable. War with Japan shall by God's grace be made impossible. It would be crazy for Japan to fight us. Shebusawa has always said that if Japan and America ever fight, it will be because both countries have degenerated into idiots. Yes, Japan would be a lunatic if she ever fought us. We buy forty per cent. of all she has to sell. What would she do without us? We buy four

hundred million dollars' worth of her silk every year. Ninety-four per cent. of all the silk she produces comes to this country. What would she do without us? Moreover, how could she fight us with her old enemy Russia in the rear? While she was busy fighting us, Russia would come down and take possession of everything she wanted. It would be insane for Japan to fight us, and we should be worse than imbeciles if we fought her. We should be devils. We are so big, so rich, so mighty. We have so much iron and so much coal and so much oil, so much money, and so many men. We are so tremendously mighty that it would be the devil in us that would permit us ever to fight Japan. Let us say as long as we live, "There shall never be a war between the United States and Japan." If anyone asserts the contrary, contradict him. No matter who it is, contradict him! We want to get rid of this talk about war.

Admire Japan wherever she is admirable. Praise her whenever she is praiseworthy. The present government of Japan is one of the best governments in the world. Nearly everything that Japan has done within the last five years has been most commendable. Her present attitude to Korea is fine. She once treated Korea roughly, but she has atoned for her sin. The present Governor-General of Korea is doing everything in his power to serve and bless the Korean people. Japan's attitude to China during the last few years has

been in every way most commendable. I was delighted to find that the old feeling of enmity has well-nigh disappeared from China and Japan. Japan has done everything in her power to show herself friendly to China. Her attitude to the United States has been in every way commendable. At the Washington Conference in 1921 the representatives of Japan came promptly out and took their place by the side of Secretary Hughes, following the suggestions of our Government, showing at every point an eager desire to help forward the peace of the world. And, then at Geneva she has shone with a glory that will not fade. Japan has gone into the World Court. She is a member of the League of Nations. In all the opium conferences she has been on the right side. Ever since the close of the Great War she has been ahead of our own Government in her devotion to the cause of world peace. Let us admire her. Let us praise her. Let us pray God that He will inspire our own country to come up and take its place by the side of Japan, safeguarding the peace of the world.

V

THE HAWAIIAN PROBLEM

PROBABLY it has never occurred to you that there is such a thing as a problem of Hawaii. You have thought of Hawaii simply as a place of beauty. The sound of the word has suggested to you palm trees and flower gardens, or if you have not thought of flowers and palms you have thought at once of sugar-cane and pineapples. A large part of our sugar comes from Hawaii and nearly all of our pineapples come from there, and why should not an American first of all think of pineapples and sugar? Or, if you have thought of human beings at all living in Hawaii you have thought of the laughing Hawaiian girls in their native dances, and you have thought of the Hawaiian men riding the surf. Hawaii has been to you nothing but a big Waikiki Beach. It has never occurred to you that there might be such a thing as a problem connected with Hawaii. You have thought of it as a paradise in the Pacific Ocean, a sort of Garden of Eden without a snake. Strange to say, there is not a snake on any one of the Hawaiian Islands. There are no cherubim

Delivered May 12, 1927.

standing with flaming sword before the gate keeping outsiders from coming in. You remember Mark Twain's remark that " The Hawaiian Islands are the loveliest fleet of islands that lie at anchor in any sea."

But I assure you there is more than beauty in Hawaii. There are problems. There are all sorts of problems there—economic and social, industrial and commercial, political and religious. Wherever you go on the face of the earth you will find men and women wrestling with problems. There are always critical situations which have to be met, always baffling problems which have to be solved. The threads of life are always getting tangled and somebody must untangle them. I found the people of Hawaii puzzling their heads over their problems just as we puzzle our heads over ours, but my subject is not the Hawaiian problems: I want to call your attention to the Hawaiian Problem. There is always a problem which overtops all the others, one whose roots reach down the deepest, one that gathers up into itself all the other perplexities and difficulties of the place. There is one problem of Hawaii which is cardinal—the racial problem. There are many races there, the Japanese, the Chinese, the Koreans and Filipinos, the Porto Ricans and Negroes. The Britons are there and the Americans and the Spanish and the Portuguese and the Germans and the Russians. When we were conducted through a

large pineapple factory near Honolulu we were told that representatives of fourteen different nations were before us; and now whenever pineapple is served on the dinner table, I always think of that factory and remember that representatives of fourteen different nations have worked together to add to my enjoyment at the dinner table.

Of course, the racial problem is not confined to Hawaii. It crops up in every quarter of the globe, but it takes on a particular form in Hawaii because the area is so limited. The problem is especially fascinating here because the stage is so narrow on which the drama is played. Hawaii is a microcosm, a little world in itself. It presents the human problem in miniature. It is a sort of clinic in which interracial diseases are being studied. It is a laboratory, a sociological laboratory in which racial and national relationships are being observed. It is a school in which men are teaching and being taught some of the great lessons which the world must learn if we are ever to have happiness and peace. It is a melting-pot in which many races are being melted and amalgamated. We call New York City a "Melting-Pot," and so it is. Hawaii is a little melting-pot in which races are being fused and blended. It is a meeting-place in which Occident and Orient come together. There is no more interesting spot in all creation than Hawaii.

One cannot be in Hawaii without asking many

deep and searching questions. What is going to become of Democracy in Hawaii? Is Democracy a form of government which will fit the needs of a community of many races, or is Democracy a form of government which is desirable only at certain times and in certain localities? Will the principles of the American Republic work successfully through a long period of time in Hawaii? What will the civilization of the United States succeed in doing in Hawaii? We have Hawaii in our grasp. We can do with it what we will. What shall we ultimately do with it? Will Hawaii become either better or worse after we have owned it for a hundred years? What will our Western civilization accomplish in Hawaii? Will Oriental civilization leave its mark on us, or will Occidental civilization leave its mark on the Orientals? Which one will leave the deeper mark, the more lasting mark? But a far more interesting question is—What will Christianity succeed in doing in the Hawaiian Islands? Is Christianity a religion which is workable in a society made up of different races? Can Christianity do anything with coloured people and white people in the same area? Are the principles of brotherly kindness and equality simply poetic sentiments, or can they be built up in the solid structure of society? "A man's a man for a' that." Is that simply a conceit of the heart or is it a possible reality in human experience? There is no doubt that Christianity is beautiful,

but the important question is, is it practical? Can it be lived? Can it be established in Hawaii? Can the kingdom of God come to Hawaii with all those different races and nations living so close together? We are always praying for the kingdom of God to come, but can it come? Do you expect that it ever will come in any community where there are different races? These are questions which set a man thinking.

It is sometimes said that Hawaii is the key to the Pacific. Just what is meant by that? It depends upon the man who uses the expression. If it is a militarist who is speaking, he means that Hawaii is the key to the military situation in the Pacific Ocean; and if a trader makes use of it he means that it is the key to commercial prosperity in that part of the world. When I use the expression I mean that it is a key to the whole problem of life presented by the nations that border on the Pacific. The problem of the Pacific is the problem of peace and good will, and the problem of Hawaii is related to this larger problem. By solving the Hawaiian problem we shall have gone a long way in solving the problem of the Pacific. What is to be the fate of Hawaii? Is it going to be a fountain of bitter water sending contaminating influences all over the world, or is it going to be a fountain flowing sweet water making glad all the nations of the earth?

It seems sometimes as though the Creator of

the world had set aside Hawaii as an experimental station. We know that God sometimes does a thing like that. A long while ago He set off a little country—Palestine—and hedged it about with deserts, desirous of working out a certain experiment in the human heart for the blessing of all the world. The Jews loved to think of Palestine as a vineyard hedged about by the God of Jacob. Jesus thought of it so, and one day told a parable which is recorded in our New Testament. According to the parable the vineyard was placed in the hands of husbandmen who were expected at fitting seasons to give fruit to the owner of the vineyard; but alas, the husbandmen of that particular vineyard refused to bring forth the fruit, and the parable closes with the question, "What will the owner of the vineyard do with such husbandmen?" Here we have another Palestine hedged about not with sand but with water, and God is at work upon another experiment, the experiment of creating peace and good will among a dozen races and a score of nationalities. What will the husbandmen do, I wonder?

At this point let me pause long enough to give you the environment of this problem. In such problems it is necessary that we get before our mind's eye the background, the historic situation out of which the problem emerges. In reading a sentence in a legal treatise, or in the Bible, it is always necessary to take into account the con-

text. The context is what goes before and what comes after. Part of the meaning of a sentence lies in the words that precede it. Another part lies in the words that come after it. You cannot catch the meaning of many a sentence without a careful study of the context. So it is with problems, you do not know how wisely to take hold of them until you know something about the forces which have created them. Let us deal, then, with certain elementary facts.

Where are the Hawaiian Islands? They are in the Pacific Ocean, 2,000 miles from San Francisco; 3,500 miles from Yokohama; 4,500 miles from Manila. They are 5,000 miles from New York City. It is because they are so far away from us that some of us never think about them. That is a remarkable fact, that the average American never thinks of Hawaii. It is an integral part of the United States. Citizens of the Hawaiian Islands are our fellow-citizens just as truly as are the citizens of Connecticut and New Jersey. They live under the stars and stripes. They are a part of the American Republic, and yet most of us never think of them. As to our duties which we owe to them, such duties never enter our mind.

There are twenty of the Hawaiian Islands, but only nine of them are inhabited, and all of these nine except one are small. Hawaii is the largest of all, containing 4,000 square miles, about half

the size of Massachusetts. The next in size is Maui, quite a small island containing only a little over 700 square miles. The third island in size is Oahu, with a little less than 600 square miles. This is the only island with which we concern ourselves in this lecture. Most of the people of Hawaii live on Oahu. Oahu contains the only large city—Honolulu—with a population of 101,000 people. There is only one other city in any island of any considerable size, and that is Hilo, with a population of about 12,000. Oahu, then, is about half the size of Rhode Island, and its total population is about 165,000. The total population of the islands is 323,000, and thus you see nearly one-third of all the people live in one city, and one-half of all the people live on one island.

Let us take a hasty glance at the history of Hawaii. You can cut its history into four periods. The first period extends from the discovery of the islands by Captain Cook, in 1778, down to 1820. We have no interest in that period in this lecture. The second period extends from 1820 to 1860, a period of forty years. In that period the American Board did its great missionary work in Hawaii. In the year 1820 a ship sailed from Boston with fourteen missionaries on board, and through the next twenty years the American Board sent to Hawaii one hundred and forty missionaries, investing in the Hawaiian work about a million dollars. The work done by the missionaries was

thorough and fine. It is one of the noblest bits of work done in any country by any missionary society. Those missionaries built their life into the social life of the people and into their political life also. Fully one-third of all the population came into the Christian Church. So successful had the work been that in 1863, when the Secretary of the American Board visited the islands, he came to the conclusion that the American Board could wisely withdraw. He felt that the Hawaiians were able to carry on the work successfully without further assistance. The Secretary of the Board was mistaken. The Hawaiians were not yet ready to carry on the work alone.

The third period, running from 1860 to 1900, was a period of decadence. Christian work in Hawaii sunk to a low ebb. Many of the churches became pastorless, and some of the pastors were inefficient. Whereas in the first forty years the Church received 53,000 members, in the next forty years it received about 12,000. To complicate matters still more, over 120,000 Orientals came in during the last forty years of the nineteenth century, bringing with them influences that were not helpful to the Christian cause. And then to make matters still worse the Government of Hawaii degenerated, falling at last into the hands of a woman, very ambitious and very autocratic, who wanted to play the part of a Mussolini, gathering up everything in her own hands. In

1893, when she was about to promulgate a new constitution depriving foreigners and natives of their legal rights, an insurrection broke out in which Americans and natives proceeded to establish a provisional government. Marines from a United States warship came ashore with artillery, and that, of course, settled the question. The poor queen could not do anything against United States artillery and promptly succumbed. In the year 1894 the Hawaiian Republic was organized and lived a precarious existence until 1898. In that year war broke out between Spain and the United States, and our Congress, fearing the unsettled condition of things in Hawaii, and not knowing what Spain might attempt to do, decided to annex the Hawaiian Islands. The resolution was accepted by the Hawaiian Republic, and in the month of August, 1898, Hawaii became an integral part of the United States. Two years later, in the year 1900, Hawaii was made a territory of the United States. The Governor of Hawaii is appointed by the President of the United States. There is also a Vice-Governor. There is a legislature consisting of two houses, the senate and the house. The senate is composed of fifteen men, the house of thirty men. The members of the senate are elected for four years. The members of the house are elected for two years. Hawaii can send to the United States Congress a delegate. He has the right to speak on the floor of the

House, but he has no vote. The differences between a state and a territory are these: A state can elect its own governor, but a territory cannot. The governor is appointed by the President. A state can frame its own constitution, but a territory cannot. The constitution of a territory is framed by the Congress of the United States. The citizens of a state can vote for a President of the United States. The citizens of a territory cannot. A state can send men to both branches of Congress. A territory cannot elect either Federal Senators or Representatives. A state can pass laws without fear of having them amended or vetoed, but any law passed by the legislature of a territory can be amended or vetoed by the Congress of the United States.

And now we are ready for the Hawaiian problem. It is a racial problem, and in order to get the dimensions of it, allow me to lay before you the following figures. There are 128,000 Japanese in Hawaii, 49,000 Filipinos, 27,000 Portuguese, 25,000 Chinese, 21,000 native Hawaiians, and only 36,000 Americans, British, Germans and Russians. And thus you see that nearly half of the population is Japanese, and this becomes all the more ominous because the Japanese are far more prolific than are Americans. The birth rate is three and a half times among the Japanese what it is among the Americans. Mr. Lothrop Stoddard, in his *Rising Tide of Colour,* calls attention to the

fact that in the year 1917 there were only two hundred and ninety-five white babies born in Hawaii, whereas the number of Japanese babies was five thousand. It would seem, therefore, that in a comparatively short time the Japanese will outnumber the white people to such an extent as to render the white people powerless. If democratic principles are allowed to prevail, if the Government is going to be by the majority, then Hawaii would seem to be fated to become a Japanese territory. There are certain principles which we Americans have adopted, and upon which we are supposed to stand. The first is that all men are created equal, and the second is that the Creator has endowed men with certain inalienable rights, such as life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and the third is that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; and the fourth is that if government is ever destructive of these ends, then it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it. Now, the question is, how can we be true to these principles, and at the same time keep Hawaii from falling into Japanese hands? There are many persons who are greatly alarmed over this prospect. A few years ago Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr., after paying a visit to the islands, came back to this country and wrote an inflammatory article picturing the direful events that were sure to come, and his one bit of advice was to send more soldiers.

To his disordered imagination, there was only one outcome possible, and that was the capture of Hawaii by Japan. The one way to prevent this tragedy was by sending more soldiers, always more soldiers. Every now and then the spirit of Mr. Vanderbilt's article stirs the hearts of a certain type of people, and sundry newspapers in various parts of the country endeavour to frighten us by holding before us the prospect of losing Hawaii.

What shall we say to this sort of propaganda? First of all, we can say that the Japanese will never take Hawaii by force. There are sixteen thousand armed soldiers and marines on Oahu, and the Japanese are unarmed. There is not the slightest danger, therefore, of the Japanese of the Hawaiian Islands ever taking possession of those islands by military force. All the physical force is in our hands, and it is not likely to pass out of them. But they might, somebody says, get economic domination. They might by their industry and their thrift little by little get into their hands the land, and owning the land they will control the destinies of the territory. That is a bugaboo. Mr. Lothrop Stoddard exploits that bugaboo in his book, but there is no likelihood of any such thing coming to pass. The great plantations both of sugar and of pineapples are in the hands of Americans, and in those hands they are certain to remain. Fear of economic domination is groundless. But how about political domina-

tion? What is going to become of Honolulu when the majority of the voters there are Japanese? In the first place, let me say that a worse fate might befall Honolulu than that. The Japanese are a fine people. I do not believe you will find anywhere in the islands an opinion contrary to that. Dr. Palmer, pastor of the Union Church, after living there for seven years and enjoying unusual opportunities for studying and understanding the whole situation, says, " I have in my heart a warm ' Aloha ' for the Japanese. They are clean, courteous, thrifty, intellectual, eager to learn, and exceedingly responsive to kind treatment." My friend, Harry B. Swartz, who was connected for years with their educational system, told me that in the schools the Japanese stand first, the Chinese second, and the white children third. Dr. Ross, of Union Theological Seminary, after a stay of five months in the islands, came home with eulogistic words for the Japanese. He told his friends at Union that at an oratorical contest at which he served as one of the judges, the speaker who carried off the highest honours was a Japanese. Why should we fear a Japanese majority, if the Japanese are intelligent and honourable and fine?

I was told by my friends that the Japanese of Hawaii are far superior to the Japanese in California. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, the Japanese in Hawaii came in response to an invitation. The owners of the great

plantations needed labourers, and so they sent to Japan to get them. In California, the Japanese are not there because of any invitation. They came of their own accord. In Hawaii there is no competition with white labour, but in California there is competition with white labour every day of the week. The result is that the Japanese have been far better treated in Hawaii than they have been treated in California, and because of this better treatment the Japanese in Hawaii is a better man.

It is an interesting fact that a man's nature depends in large measure upon the way in which he is dealt with. It is with men as it is with dogs. You can make a dog one of the most affectionate and obedient of all creatures by kind treatment. If you feed him and pat him and speak kindly to him, he will respond and become your most faithful and enthusiastic friend. If, on the other hand, you cuff him and kick him and scold him and half starve him, he becomes a snarling, ugly creature, treacherous and dangerous. Just so it is with men, trust them, believe in them, be kind to them and they become noble and reliable. In Hawaii the Japanese have been decently and honourably treated, and the result is a noble race of men. Why should anybody fear a Japanese majority at the ballot-box? We Americans are the last people in the world who ought to be frightened by the prospect of a Japanese majority. Have we

not allowed the Irishmen to rule, not only one city but several, and why should we imagine that a Japanese government would not be equal to a government established by the Irish? In certain parts of the country we have allowed the Germans to rule, and German-ruled cities are not inferior to cities ruled by citizens of American birth. In Minnesota more than one city is ruled by the Swedes, but Minnesota is not complaining because of that. If the time should ever arrive when Honolulu comes under a Japanese government, I have no doubt the government will be as efficient as it has ever been under American rule.

But there is no immediate prospect of this Japanese domination. There are less than thirteen hundred registered Japanese voters, and there are nearly seventeen thousand registered American voters. The experts who have been forecasting the future say that in the year 1940 the Japanese vote will be only twenty-nine per cent. of the whole. The people, therefore, who are shouting in terror and painting black pictures of the awful consequences that are coming are largely hysterical, and we need not be disturbed by what they say. The problem of Hawaii is a problem which cannot be settled in a day or a year, but it is a problem which can be settled if Americans use common sense and a Christian spirit.

There are certain obstacles in the way, certain adverse forces with which we are obliged to con-

tend. First of all, there is the military force. The Hawaiian Islands are being militarized. We have in Oahu fourteen thousand soldiers and two thousand marines. I was told before arriving that there were thirty thousand soldiers there. I had a friend of mine go to headquarters and get me the exact figures, and these are the figures he brought me: Fourteen thousand soldiers, two thousand marines, or sixteen thousand in all now on an island containing only a hundred and sixty-five thousand people. Sixteen thousand armed men are an influential body. Everywhere you go in Oahu you have your eyes on something that suggests either the army or navy. You are awakened every morning by the booming of cannon. I do not know why they shoot those cannon off at such an ungodly hour. If the purpose is to awaken the soldiers, I am sure that less powder would be equally efficacious. All day long, and sometimes into the night you hear the whirring of airplanes over your head. There are army and navy aviators doing all sorts of stunts, preparing for the next war, in this particular case preparing for the war which is likely to come with Japan. Soldiers are always an irritant, especially if they belong to a different race from the people of the country in which they are stationed. I found British soldiers in India an irritant. They have bumptious, cocky ways which the Indians resent. I found that foreign soldiers in Peking are an irritant. I shall never

forget the Japanese soldiers I saw on the wall of the legation, and the Italian soldiers which I saw on another wall, and down in the street there was a little company of Chinese soldiers. And when I saw those three sets of men I felt that the time would come when the Chinese soldiers would blow the foreign soldiers into eternity. Our fathers would not allow the Redcoats of England to stay here. Their presence was a constant irritant. At last they could endure it no longer and the Redcoats had to go. That will be the fate of all foreign soldiers in every country. No nation will allow soldiers of another country to be located permanently within its bounds.

In the case of Hawaii the soldiers are Americans, and Hawaii is a territory of the United States, but nevertheless the soldiers are an irritant. They suggest force. The uniform of a soldier or a marine suggests force. Soldiers talk a good deal about war. We cannot wonder at that. Their business is war, and they have to talk it. War talk is always mischief-making. You cannot have a great crowd of men talking and thinking war in Hawaii without causing trouble. I met a number of the officers, and they are fine men. I met some of the soldiers, and the ones I met were fine, but in every large camp there are numbers of men who are not fine. The men who volunteer for the army and navy come from all classes, and some of them are tough. By their

behaviour and their vices they disgrace themselves and their country. I was pleased to hear good reports of our army in Hawaii, but I was saddened also by the stories which I heard on the other side. It is said that a million dollars is spent every month in the city of Honolulu by our soldiers there. In this way the whole city is militarized. Almost everybody comes to believe in a big army and a big navy and in the all-sufficiency of physical force.

The tourist influence is also against us. There are, to be sure, many well-behaved and sensible tourists, but there are also many of the other kind. Every country is more or less demoralized through which American tourists make their way. Many Americans are fools when it comes to using money, and many are fools when it comes to using their tongue, and many are fools when it comes to dealing with men and women of coloured races. There are fourteen thousand tourists landing in Hawaii every year. Some of them are mischief-making. They make it more difficult for the experiment of peace and good will to succeed.

Our own United States Congress is also at times a disturbing and retarding force. Our Congress has again and again neglected Hawaii, failing to do things which it ought to have done, refusing the help which was needed, denying the justice which ought to have been granted. When our Congress passed the Asiatic Exclusion Act it com-

plicated still further all our relations with the nations of the Far East. Many Japanese fathers and mothers in Hawaii are not American citizens. They never can be American citizens, but their children are all American citizens. According to the Fourteenth Amendment of our Constitution, every person born under the United States flag is an American citizen. And so you have a gap existing between parent and child leading to many tragic situations. One day I paid a visit to Pearl Harbour, and the friend who took me in his automobile had a Japanese chauffeur. The chauffeur was an American citizen, but when we came to the gate a naval officer ordered the Japanese to get out of the car, telling him that he was not allowed to go down to the harbour. The Japanese was a fine-spirited, genial, patriotic man. He loves our country, but I wondered how deep this smart was when a naval officer told him that because he was a Japanese he was not permitted to go where we two white men were privileged to go. He was suspected. He was an American citizen, but he could not be trusted, because he was a Japanese.

Many troublesome questions arise in the field of education. Japanese born in Japan are patriotic. They love their old country as they ought to do. They love their language, which is also proper. They want their children to know the Japanese language. That is also commendable, and so they want their own private schools. They

have what they call "language schools," and in some cases these schools are under the control of Buddhist priests, and it is not always clear just what teaching the children in these schools receive. There have been some ugly disputes about the schools. Some would abolish them forthwith; others would hedge them round with hampering limitations. Religion is also another disturbing force. There are over eighty Buddhist temples and Shintoist shrines, more than twice as many Christian churches. Only about two and a half per cent. of the Japanese population have given a favourable response to the Christian appeal. Japanese boys and girls are not becoming Christians, but many of them are not becoming Buddhists, either. They are growing up without any religious belief of any sort. This is also a misfortune and may lead to disaster. There are many forces working to complicate the problem, but nevertheless I believe the problem can be solved.

As Professor Adams has well said, "The problem of Hawaii is the problem of ourselves. It depends entirely on ourselves how this problem is to be worked out. If we have common sense and the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth, there is no doubt at all concerning the outcome, but if we have arrogance and selfishness, snobbishness, and a reckless disregard both of justice and of courtesy, then there are dark days ahead. Hawaii will either be a blessing or a curse to the whole human race."

When you arrive in Hawaii the first word that is said to you is "Aloha." It is a beautiful word expressive of good will. They say it to you on all occasions. When they meet you they say "Aloha." That is equivalent to "How do you do? I hope you are well." When they part from you they say "Aloha." That means "Good-bye. God be with you until we meet again." Sometimes when they say it they mean simply, "I like you. I am your friend. I want you to be my friend, too." They speak it in different intonations. The intonation depends on the precise significance of the word. After they have said "Aloha" they put a *lei* around your neck. A *lei* is a wreath of flowers. They have such an abundance of flowers that they make an abundance of wreaths. They will put two and three around your neck. I have seen men with half a dozen on. It is a friendly country. The native Hawaiian is a genial, friendly human being. The sun has gotten into his blood and into his heart. He is affectionate and trustful and kind. An Old Testament prophet, in describing a vision of heaven, declared that he saw "A rainbow around the throne." The rainbow is the symbol of hope. As I sailed away from Hawaii, I saw a rainbow around the islands.

Printed in the United States of America

S. HALL YOUNG, D.D.

Author of "Adventures in Alaska," Etc.

Hall Young of Alaska

An Alaskan Autobiography.

Profusely Illustrated, $4.00

To have had such a teeming life as Dr. Young's would exhaust every energy of the normal human being; but to harness one's powers to the task of passing on to others its adventures and enthusiasms, in graphic chapters that make the readers able to re-live it in their own minds and souls—this sets the climax of super-achievement on Dr. Young's eighty tremendous years. Here are thrills, heart-stirrings, incitements to adventure and achievement by the score which all readers will want to make their own.

JOHN T. FARIS *Author of "Making Good," etc.*

The Alaskan Pathfinder

The Story of Sheldon Jackson. New edition. Introduction by Dr. John A. Marquis, Gen. Sec. Presbyterian Board National Missions.

Illustrated, $1.50

"Dr. Sheldon Jackson did a pioneer work in Alaska that can never be repeated and that will not need to be done again."—*Presbyterian Banner.*

W. M. DOUGLAS

Andrew Murray and His Message $1.75

"Mr. Douglas was an intimate friend of Andrew Murray. The life story of an exceedingly interesting man, told in a most interesting way. To be brought into contact with this holy man will be the rare privilege of every reader of this volume."—*Watchman Examiner.*

JAMES O. DOBSON

Saint Francis: The Little Poor Man of Assisi $1.50

Outlines his life, his stirring experiences and his teachings, and indicates the significance of all these for the life of men and women of the twentieth century. The book has distinct educational and thought-arousing value.

The Lorenz Guide Books in Handy Form

D. E. LORENZ, Ph.D.

The New Mediterranean Traveller

New Pocket Edition. Revised to Date.

Thin paper, round corners, $5.00

The Round the World Traveller

New Pocket Edition. Revised to Date.

Thin paper, round corners, $5.00

CHARLES A. SELDEN

Washington Correspondent, "Ladies Home Journal"

Are Missions a Failure?

A Correspondent's Survey of Foreign Missions. $2.50

What sort of people are foreign missoinaries? Is their work quite hopeless, or does some degree of success reward it? To answer such questions as these *The Ladies' Home Journal* sent Mr. Selden, a journalist of wide acquaintance of men and events, on a seven-months' tour of the mission stations in Asia, both Catholic and Protestant, and this book is his report to the journal and to the American people. He traveled 30,000 miles, interviewing 300 leaders in many lands. The book is an informing and awakening document of deep concern to the thoughtful people of America.

CLELAND B. McAFEE, D.D.

Professor, McCormick Theological Seminary

Changing Foreign Missions

A Re-valuation of the Church's Greatest Enterprise. $2.00

Dr. McAfee, long an authority on foreign missions, writes from a year's first-hand study of missionary principles, methods and prospects as encountered on the foreign field itself. In Syria, Egypt, India, Siam, China, Korea and Japan new conditions and aspirations among the people and converts have led to the emergence of new missionary problems, and Dr. McAfee suggests how the churches at home and the missionaries on the field can most effectively meet the changing situation. Dr. McAfee's book is likely to be recognized as a very notable addition to the literature of missions.

KATHARINE SCHERER CRONK

Edited by her husband, E. C. Cronk

Missionary Methods for Church and Home

Principles and Programs Tested in Practical Experience. Introduction by Delavan L. Pierson. $1.50

After a lifetime of devoted missionary work during which she became known far and wide as an expert on missionary methods, Mrs. Cronk left the manuscript of this book, for the inspiration of others, at the time of her recent death. It consists of distinctly practical and tested helps on such phases of missionary endeavor as increasing attendance, music in meetings, missionary prayers, missions in the Sunday School, dramatization and pageants, material for missionary talks, and many others.

CONWAY T. WHARTON

Missionary in Africa for Southern Presbyterian Mission

The Leopard Hunts Alone

The Life and Ways of The Congo People and How They Welcomed Christianity. Illustrated, $1.25

A book of travel, description and missions, a vivid narrative description of the lives, characteristics and customs of unrelieved savagery among the Bakuba people of the Belgian Congo; and a thrilling recital of the true story of how Christianity came to the Bakubas, how it struggled valiantly to gain a foothold, how it won its way, slowly but ever against the stalwart opposition of him who was to be King. "I am the leopard, I hunt alone!" he proclaims—and his sovereign decree regarding Christianity is forthwith uttered. Mr. Wharton has been a missionary of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. (Southern) for many years.

BELLE M. BRAIN (Compiler)

Compiler of "Love Stories of Great Missionaries," etc.

From Every Tribe and Nation

Fifty New Missionary Stories. $1.50

This new compilation of missionary stories tells of inspiring lives of Christian converts on the foreign field. Workers in Sunday Schools, missionary meetings, and mission study classes, and also preachers of missionary sermons, will find them very usable and effective. Miss Brain's earlier popular books of missionary stories foretell an extensive use of the new volume.

MAUDE WHITMORE MADDEN

Author of "In the Land of the Cherry Blossoms"

Young Hearts in Old Japan

Japanese-American Interpretations.
Illustrated, $1.50

The color, the fragrance, the delicacy and the indefinable charm of Japan—all these are in this new vivid and alluring volume by Mrs. Madden. The captivating chapters vibrate with human interest. This is a book to enlarge one's understanding of the Japanese, to increase one's admiration for them, and to quicken one's appreciation of the value of Christian missions among them.

AMY CARMICHAEL

Author of "Things as They Are," etc.

Raj, Brigand Chief

A Robin Hood of Southern India,
Illustrated, $2.50

A true story of adventure, outlawry, persecution and endurance centering around Raj, a young athlete of southern India, well-born and prosperous, who though innocent of crime, fell into the hands of the native police. Almost incredible in spite of its truth, the book is thrilling in every incident and in every sense of the word.

JAMES LIVINGSTONE STEWART

Author of "The Laughing Buddha," Etc.

The Goddess of Mercy

A Tale of Love and Turmoil in Modern China. $2.00

The same vivid, colorful, richly informative stuff that Dr. Stewart gave in "The Laughing Buddha." First of all, it is a rattling tale, the kind that knows no clock. In the second place, there hasn't been a prettier idyl of first love since "Paul et Virginie." But finally and all the time, what a light the story throws on the present situation in China!

FERDINAND DUCHÊNE

Twice Recipient of the Grand Prize in Literature, Algiers.

Thamilla (The Turtle Dove)

A Story of the Mountains of Algeria. Translated from the French by Isabelle May and Emily M. Newton. With frontispiece, $1.75

In the French original the novel, with the same title, has received wide and enthusiastic acclaim. On the other hand, the work offers to the lovers of travel and to students of missions a vivid and intimate portrait of the lands, peoples, and customs of northern Africa, particularly of Algeria, Tunis and Morocco; and especially of the life of a native woman subject to native laws. Frankly an unusual book which should win a large, appreciative reading.

ISABEL BROWN ROSE *Author of "Red Blossoms"*

The Measure of Margaret

A Tale of India. $1.75

Romance, adventure, humor and vivid characterization combine to make this latest story of Mrs. Rose quite up to the high standard set by her earlier works. England, Naples and the shadow of Vesuvius also figure in the picture, although the native state of Shahupur, and the teeming life of the East Indies furnish the motif.

It is not too much to predict for Mrs. Rose's latest work that it will add immensely to her enviable reputation.

PIERREPONT B. NOYES

Author of "While Europe Waits for Peace"

The Pallid Giant

A Novel of Yesterday and Tomorrow. $2.00

A stirring tale of mystery and adventure in Paris that ought to mark its appearance as one of the publishing sensations of the season. Two great emotions are paramount throughout the novel which revolves around the discovery of an ancient Ms.; love between individuals and love for country, and fear between man and man, tribe and tribe, nation and nation. The author is a man of wide experience in world affairs; having served in Europe on the important American Rhineland Commission.

D443.J4
Five world problems
3 0629 0075142 4
WITHDRAWN
D
443
J4
WITHDRAWN